

Classical Philology

VOL. I

January, 1906

No. 1

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF ARISTOPHANES. I

BY JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE

The extant manuscripts of Aristophanes number about two hundred and forty. I append a list of these arranged in alphabetical order according to countries and cities. This list is very nearly complete.

But what constitutes a manuscript? The libraries catalogue all they possess, even those written in the eighteenth century, with religious care. The printing-press, however, establishes a limit. The first edition of Aristophanes was published at the end of the fifteenth century, nearly fifty years after the invention of the art of printing. Editions of the comic poet thereafter multiplied rapidly; twelve that were 'complete' were published in the next century. But it would be a mistake on this account to reject all manuscripts written after 1498; for many that are serviceable in establishing the text of the author and are demonstrably free from contamination with printed books belong to the sixteenth century.¹ Those written in the next two centuries must establish their claims to consideration or be cast out. The public library in Upsala possesses a 'manuscript' of Aristophanes of the seventeenth century that contains seven comedies.² An announcement of any new manuscript that contained more than the three Byzan-

¹ Cod. Parisini 2715 and 2717 have played an important rôle in establishing the text of Aristophanes.

² *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, 3^e série, tome XV (1889), p. 351.
[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY I, January, 1906] 1

tine plays would at once waken interest; but this book proved to be a copy of part of the edition issued at Basle in 1547. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has two manuscripts of the *Equites*;¹ both are dated 1602, and both are in the handwriting of Isaac Casaubon. Some scholar must examine the text and determine its source, if possible. Any real manuscript of the *Equites* would have value. But by 1602 the play was in print in many editions, and Casaubon, a bookish man and a prolific maker of books, may have copied or constituted the text from printed sources. Just this happened a century and a half later. The same great library has six eighteenth-century manuscripts of Aristophanes that once belonged to Brunck.² I examined two of these³ in the summer of 1904. An hour's inspection determined their value. These manuscripts, as the library names them, contain readings that are found in no earlier manuscript, but are due to the conjectures of Dawes⁴ and other scholars. Presumably, therefore, the other four "Manuscrits de Brunck" also are simply the texts that he prepared for his own or the printer's use. They are not manuscripts. The same caution must be used in dealing with late manuscripts elsewhere; all the great libraries possess them. In the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome many 'manuscripts' are preserved that were written either by Allacci himself or by his order. Among these are two that contain parts relating to Aristophanes;⁵ one of these parts consists solely of scholia on the *Nubes*. What is their source? That remains to be determined, if anybody thinks the task worth while, but it is certain that Allacci had access to the *Princeps* of Aristophanes, which contains a remarkably full and good collection of scholia on nine

¹ Cod. Latini 8181 and 8451. Both were annotated by Casaubon. I conjecture that these are part of the sources on which Kuster depended in his *variorum* edition. Cf. the end of the preface of his book: "Has autem Notas, quae antea in Bibliotheca Regia Parisiensi, incredibili optimorum cujusvis generis librorum copia instructa, latebant, suis sumptibus et Autographo describi curavit, Lutetiaeque ad me misit, Vir Illustris Nicolaus Franciscus Remondus, clarus inter Gallos," etc.

² Supplement 347, 354-58.

³ Supplement 356, containing the *Vespa*, *Pax*, *Aves*, and 358, containing the *Aves*, *Vespa*, *Pax*.

⁴ The first edition of Dawes's *Miscellanea critica* was published in 1745.

⁵ Cod. Allatiani 137 and 142.

plays, including the *Nubes*. Furthermore, by 1607 three other editions of these nine plays with scholia had been published. Allacci died in 1669, and was not the man to refrain from appropriating without acknowledgment whatever he desired—although, in truth, this was the general practice of his time. He was that *bibliotecario* of the Vatican who brought the Heidelberg manuscripts to Rome, a rank plunderer. Bentley characterized him as “malevolentia et livor, non homo”! Among the books in the Biblioteca Ottoboniana, now in the Vatican, there is a manuscript that wakened interest when it was announced in 1892, because, as it was supposed, it contained nine plays and was of the sixteenth century.¹ Nine titles, in fact, stand on the recto of the first folio. Only three manuscripts, the Codex Ravennas not included, are extant that contain nine plays. Another genuine manuscript that contained nine plays might be an important addition to our resources, but the book proved to be a disappointment. It contains the *Plutus* of Aristophanes (“Ἀριστοφάνους Πλούτος κομωιδῆα”), the *Medea* and fifteen verses of the *Hypolytus* of Euripides, the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, and some other small matters. It is a schoolboy’s book of the seventeenth century, with a feeble interlinear version in Latin.

Manuscripts, therefore, written in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must be sharply examined before they are used. It is, of course, possible that they may have independent value, as copies of earlier manuscripts of good tradition that have been lost. A copy made even as late as 1650 of any of the manuscripts that were destroyed by fire in the Escorial Library in 1671 would now be worthy of inspection. If Isaac Vos’s manuscript of the *Lysistrata*,² a fragment of a famous fourteenth century book, had gone to the bottom of the North Sea in the evil-sailing ship that carried Gerard Vos’s great library out of England, Bentley’s copy of it,³ which has been widely used, would be a treasure, as indeed it is, because of its associations. This point may be illustrated in another manner. The second manu-

¹ Cod. Ottobonianus 307.

² Cod. Vossiani 77 and 191, now in Leyden.

³ Now in Trinity College Library, Cambridge; Cod. 984 (R. 16. 36).

script of Aristophanes in point of age is now in St. Mark's Library.¹ It was written in the twelfth century in the workshop of some Byzantine monastery, and in the fifteenth century belonged to Cardinal Bessarion, who left it by will, with other valuable manuscripts,² to the republic of Venice. It is hard to read, and Bessarion, although he was a Greek, found it slow work to extract from it the tripping jests of Aristophanes.³ He therefore had it copied by one of his table companions. The copy is beautifully executed on vellum and reads like print.⁴ It is demonstrable, I think, that the copyist had only the older manuscript before him when at work; his copy shows no trace of the influence of other manuscripts, and is faithful, as copies go. At present this fifteenth-century manuscript has only inferior value, but if its twelfth-century original had been destroyed at any time before 1902, when it was reproduced in facsimile, the copy would at once have become priceless.

All the manuscripts that date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will, without doubt, be examined in due time, and their value estimated. Meanwhile I have thought it proper to include them in the list. Their subsequent exclusion, if they prove to be valueless, will not be difficult. They are relatively few in number—twenty-six. To these I add sixteen others whose dates have not yet been determined.⁵

There remain one hundred and ninety-five. Two of these, fragments of the *Aves*, belong respectively to the sixth⁶ and tenth⁷ centuries; all the rest can be assigned, with greater or less confidence, to one of the six centuries from the eleventh to the

¹ Cod. Venetus 474.

² See Omont, *Inventaire des Mss. donnés à Saint Marc de Venise par le Cardinal Bessarion*.

³ It speaks well for many fathers of the church, including St. Chrysostom, that they have found solace in our poet.

⁴ It is clear from internal evidence that some toilers in St. Mark's Library have shirked the harder book and collated this in its stead.

⁵ The correctness of the dating of some of the manuscripts in the list is not certain; the age of these must finally be determined by experts.

⁶ A parchment fragment, now in the Musée du Louvre.

⁷ A parchment palimpsest fragment, forming part of Cod. Laurentianus LX. 9, in Florence.

sixteenth inclusive. One hundred and seventy of these contain the text or part of the text of the plays, and about one hundred of this number contain also scholia. I have placed the remainder under the heading "Supplementary." These contain only extracts, variously designated as sententiae (γνώμαι) or florilegia, or only scholia, or only arguments.

Interest naturally centers in the one hundred and seventy that furnish the text of the plays. I give a few statistics.

MANUSCRIPTS COUNTED WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR AGE¹

Century.....	6th	10th	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th	16th
No. of MSS.....	1	1	1	1	4	25½	88	48½

WITH REFERENCE TO NUMBER OF PLAYS OR PARTS OF
PLAYS CONTAINED²

No. of Plays.....	11	9	8	7	6	4	3	2	1
No. of MSS.....	1	3	1	4	3	14	47	58	40

WITH REFERENCE TO NUMBER OF TIMES EACH PLAY OCCURS²

Plays.....	<i>Plut.</i>	<i>Nub.</i>	<i>Ran.</i>	<i>Eq.</i>	<i>Av.</i>	<i>Ach.</i>	<i>Vesp.</i>	<i>Pax</i>	<i>Lys.</i>	<i>Ec.</i>	<i>Thesm.</i>
No. of MSS.....	148	127	76	28	18	14	10	8	8	7	2

Other manuscripts of Aristophanes than those named in the list given below are known once to have been extant. There is authentic record that some have been destroyed by fire. Valuable manuscripts in the Escorial were lost in this way in 1671. Cod. χ I 16, now in that library, is a catalogue of its Greek manuscripts, made by Nicolas de la Torre before the fire. It records six manuscripts of Aristophanes, some of which were lost irretrievably.³ The great disaster in Turin is more recent. That

¹ If a manuscript, the age of which is doubtful, is dated in two centuries in the list, the later is taken in this count. But note that two manuscripts, Cod. 2626 in Cambridge and Cod. Riccardianus 48 in Florence, each belong, part in one century, part in another.

² Cod. 113 in Ferrara is counted double.

³ Graux, in his *Essai sur l'origine du fonds grec de l'Escorial* (1880), identifies two of these with T III 16 and Ω IV 7, manuscripts now extant. But Miller, in his *Catalogue des Mss. grecs de la bibliothèque de l'Escorial* (1848), identifies T III 16, and only that.

library contained three manuscripts of Aristophanes; one of these was of unusual interest.¹ I wrote to the librarian, Signor Carta, from Rome about it shortly after the fire, and he replied that nothing was left—"neppure un frammento." The utmost effort has been made to preserve and restore the fragments of the manuscripts that were rescued, and a provisional account of the result has been published.² Remains of two of the manuscripts that contained Aristophanes have been saved.³ I have thought it proper to include the Turin books in the list.

Other manuscripts of our poet would seem naturally to fall under the caption "Strayed, Lost, or Stolen"—and "Found"! They begin to go astray early. The editor of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and *Lysistrata* in the first Juntine edition announced with pride his use of a certain "Codex Urbinas." Modern editors made vain search for this manuscript, and in default of the original quoted the printed book. It was not till 1871 that W. G. Clark⁴ and A. von Velsen⁵ independently demonstrated that this "Urbinas" was the celebrated Cod. Ravennas. The identification is certain. Kuster's manuscripts have been identified, with perhaps the exception of his "Cod. Bodleianus." The early editors designated their manuscripts in a vague, happy-go-lucky manner, to the extreme vexation of their successors. The record for exasperating unintelligibility is held by Ernesti. Even the acute Hermann, though a German, identified only one of his manuscripts, although he re-edited Ernesti's collations within a short time after his death. Some of them, especially two "Iesuit. Paris," still wander like lost ghosts to torment the living. The most celebrated case is perhaps "Brunck's Aristophanes." In his edition he calls this "codex meus" and gives it the symbol D. It has been largely quoted, but even in the latest editions always from Brunck's own collations; and Dobree's suggestion that, on

¹Cod. B V 34. Both Professor Zacher and Professor Zuretti have made use of this manuscript, and will publish, it is to be hoped, whatever collations they have of its important scholia.

²*Rivista di filologia* XXXII (1904), pp. 385 ff.

³*Rivista*, pp. 419, 427.

⁴*Journal of Philology* III, pp. 153 ff.

⁵*Ueber den Codex Urbinas der Lysistrata und der Thesmophoriazusen des Aristophanes* (Halle).

Brunck's death, it came into the possession of Richard Heber, when all trace of it was lost, has been often repeated. But it was purchased in Rotterdam by George Butler, afterwards Head Master of Harrow and Dean of Peterborough, and in 1876 was presented by H. Montagu Butler, Master of Trinity, to Trinity College Library.¹

Hardly less famous are Bekker's "Mutinenses." There were three of these, which he collated in Paris.² His readings from them have been often quoted, but the manuscripts disappeared from Paris and from the ken of scholars. Beyond doubt, they were sent back to Italy with other spoil which the first Napoleon had swept away. W. G. Clark, in 1869, acutely suggested that Bekker's "M" was identical with the single manuscript of Aristophanes now preserved in the Biblioteca Capitolare in Verona.³ Some other manuscripts have not yet been identified.⁴

It will be apparent from the account that is to follow of the recorded use of these manuscripts by scholars since the end of the fifteenth century that, while the oldest books have often been collated and some others diligently studied, many fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts have never even been examined. The choice of the manuscripts that have been used seems often to have been due to environment⁵ or even chance.

Cobet's contemptuous opinion of the manuscripts of Aris-

¹ Cod. R. I. 42. See Montague James Rhodes, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, II (1901), pp. 11 f. This manuscript was once in the possession of Porson, towards the end of his life, but he seems not to have made use of it. W. G. Clark made notes from it while it was still in possession of the Dean of Peterborough. These notes are preserved in the library of Trinity College.—On the third folio is written: "Sum Beati Rhenani. Nec muto dominum"!

² "Mutinenses autem Parisiis vocabantur quotquot ex Italia superiore allati erant." Bekker's *Aristophanes* I, Praefatio, p. vi.

³ *Journal of Philology* II, p. 312. Clark does not state his reasons, but among them, doubtless, was the fact that the Verona manuscript carries not only the stamp of the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris, but also the coat of arms of the Estensi. See Omont in *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* VIII (1891), pp. 489 ff. A manuscript, precisely answering to the Verona manuscript, was lost from the Biblioteca Estense early in the nineteenth century. This is described in Gabardi's written Catalogue I, p. 274. See *Studi italiani* IV (1896), p. 440. Clark's conjecture could easily be verified by anybody in Verona.

⁴ The manuscript numbered 3436 in Bernard's "Catalogi;" Invernizi's "Cod. Borgiaeus," now perhaps in the Vatican, and a few others.

⁵ If the immense Vatican collections had been in Germany during the past two hundred years, we should know more about them.

tophanes¹ has now less weight than when the master first pronounced it. The study of the papyri has rudely shaken the authority of the whole race of diviners, and is gradually establishing belief in the trustworthiness of the traditional text furnished by mediaeval manuscripts. We have a bit of similar evidence for Aristophanes. The oldest extant source of any part of his text is the vellum fragment, found in the Fayûm and now in the Louvre, mentioned above.² It contains fifty-six verses of the *Aves*, with scholia, and is of capital significance in the respect now under consideration. It is five hundred years older than the Cod. Ravennas, but its text shows no important discrepancies from that of the extant manuscripts of the *Aves*. It therefore confirms the integrity of the tradition represented by these manuscripts. But the results of the study of the papyri have a wider application; they show that the 'inferior' manuscripts have an authority that heretofore has been denied them.³ I quote the recent statement of a recognized authority:

The favourite method of modern scholarship, and one by which much has been gained in textual criticism, has been to endeavour to trace the relationships of the various manuscripts of an author, to divide them into families, to determine which manuscript or family represents the best tradition, and then to follow this evidence of the family or manuscript in almost all cases of doubt. But the papyri have shown us decisively in some cases, and allow us to argue by analogy to others, that these family divisions are of relatively late origin, and that the better MSS. have no sort of monopoly of ancient and correct readings. In future . . . the critical editor . . . will have to be prepared to find the truth not unfrequently among the witnesses who usually are inferior, and to exercise a freer judgment in deciding between them.⁴

The study of the later manuscripts of Aristophanes, especially of those which are not yet known, assumes a new importance.

(To be continued)

¹ *Novae lectiones*, pp. 253 ff. Cobet himself, in his youth, collated the Cod. Venetus: "quem ipse olim cum pulvisculo excusai"! This collation is now preserved in the University Library in Leyden.

² Weil, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions* (1884), pp. 723 ff., and *Revue de philologie* VI (1882), pp. 179 ff.

³ Cobet could say, in speaking of the Ravennas and Venetus: "habentur pro optimis, quia caeteri omnes sunt etiam multo peiores nequioresque."

⁴ F. G. Kenyon on "The Evidence of Greek Papyri with Regard to Textual Criticism," in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* I (1904).

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS¹

BELGIUM

BRUSSELS

Bibliothèque Royale

- 4280-83 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. S ff. 118-221. + XV. Br1
 11367 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. S ff. 1-96. XV. Br2
 11344 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-112. XV. Br3

DENMARK

COPENHAGEN

Royal Library

- 1980 (Havn.) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Ach. Vesp. Av. Pax (1-947, 1012-1354, 1357), Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-1097, 1237-end). Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-318. XV. H
 418 Pl. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-42. XV. H2

ENGLAND

CAMBRIDGE

Library of the University of Cambridge

- 2626 N^N III 15 (Cant. 1) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-92. XV (Pl. Nub. 1-470), XIV (Nub. 500-end, Ran.). Ct1
 2626 N^N III 15 (Cant. 2) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-151. XV. (Bound with the foregoing.) Ct2
 2614 N^N III 3 (Cant. 3) Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-83. XV. Ct3
 2627 N^N III 16 (Cant. 4) Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-144. + XV. Ct4

SUPPLEMENTARY

- 696 Dd XI 70 Arg. Schol. Metres to Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. S ff. 25-80 + XVI. Ct5

Library of Trinity College

- 459 R. 1. 42 (D Brunck=E Dindorf) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. —Rare Schol. Gloss. on Pl. S ff. 1-194. XV. ("Brunck's Aristophanes.") Ct6
 984 R. 16. 36 (Voss. Küster=Trin. Dobree) Lys. Av. (1492-1523). Schol. M ff. 1-54. XVII. XVIII. (Bentley's copy of Cod. Vossianus 77.) Ct7

LONDON

British Museum

- Harleianus 6307 (Harl. 6 Dobree) Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-181. XV. Ln6

¹So far as possible, each entry includes: *Shelf-mark*; *Contents*; *Size*; (*S*=cm. 1-27, *M*=cm. 28-37, *L*=cm. 38+); *Number of Folios* (+ signifies that the manuscript has other contents); *Age*; *Symbol* (actual, in parentheses after the shelf-mark; suggested, at the end).

- Harleianus* 5629 Nub. (291-342). *S* + XV. Ln2
Harleianus 5664 (A Porson) Pl. (235-end), Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Ln3
 Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 71-238. XV.
Harleianus 5725 (Harl. 5 Dobree) Pl. (266-end), Nub. Schol. Ln5
 —Arg. to Nub. and also Ran. *S* ff. 1-139. XV.
Additions 12182 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1-143. Ln4
 XV.
Arundelianus 530 (Ar. Dobree) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. *S* ff. 1-103. Ln1
 XV.
Harleianus 1675 Pl. Gloss. *S* ff. 54-74. + XVI (1591). Ln7

OXFORD

Bodleian Library

- Baroecianus* 127 (B Porson) Pl. (561-end), Nub. Ran. (1-1384).
 Schol. Gloss. on Pl.—Arg. Schol. (rare) on Nub. Ran. *S* ff. O3
 1-88. XIII.
Baroecianus 34 (1 Porson) Pl. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. *S* ff. 59-143. + O1
 XV.
Baroecianus 43 (2 Porson) Pl. (1-124, 349-end), Nub. (1-379, 546-
 end). Schol. Gloss. on Pl.—Schol. on Nub.—Arg. to Ran. O2
S ff. 1-145. XV.
D'Orvillianus 72 (*X. 1. 3. 13*) (Dorv. Dobree) Pl. Nub. Schol. *S* ff. O4
 1-94. + XV (1441).
Canonicianus 40 (Bodl. 6 Blaydes) Pl. (defective), Nub. Proleg. O6
 Arg. Schol.—Gloss. on Pl. *S* ff. 1-126. + XV.
Canonicianus 46 (Bodl. 7 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Arg. *S* ff. 1-110. O7
 XV.
Miscellaneus 246 (Bodl. 9 Blaydes) Pl. (1-773). Gloss. *S* ff. 1-41. O9
 XV.
Miscellaneus 150 (Bodl. 8 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 1-101. XVI. O8

SUPPLEMENTARY

- Baroecianus* 38 (Bar. Dübner) Schol. on Lys. Arg. *S* ff. 63-84. + O10
 XV.
Miscellaneus 101. Schol. on Lys. Arg. *S* ff. 1-16. XVIII. (Copy O11
 of the foregoing.)

Library of Lincoln College

- X. 1.* (probably Küster's Bodl.) Pl. Arg. Schol. *S* ff. 1-39. O12
 XVII.

FRANCE

AGEN

Bibliothèque d'Agen

- 20 Pl. Proleg. *S* ff. 93-163. + XVI. Ag

CAEN

Bibliothèque de Caen

SUPPLEMENTARY

- 451 Schol. on Lys. Arg. S ff. 1-21. XVII. (Copy of Baroccianus 38, ff. 63-84.) Ca

MONTPELLIER

Bibliothèque de Montpellier

SUPPLEMENTARY

- 337 Schol. on Pl. Nub. Ran. S ff. 1-138. XVI. Mn

PARIS

Musée du Louvre

- Parchemins* Av. (1057-1085, 1101-1127). Schol. VI. (Fragment, written in uncials, found in the Fayûm.)

Bibliothèque Nationale

- 2712 (A) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Ach. Ec. (1-282). Proleg. Arg.—Schol. Gloss. on Nub. Ran. (1-186). M pp. (not ff.) 107-110, 213-224, 227-230. + XIII. A
- 2820 (F Dindorf) Pl. (defective), Nub. (defective), Ran. Arg.—Schol. on Ran. S ff. 1-40, 51-88. XIV. P25
- Supplement 135* (C Brunck = D Dindorf) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-235. XIV. P19
- Supplement 463* Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Schol. S ff. 1-118. XIV. P20
- Supplement 655* Pl. Proleg. Schol. M ff. 1-29. + XIV. P22
- 2821 (Par. 8 Blaydes = Q Studemund) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-103. XIV. P8
- 2598 Pl. Nub. Gloss. S ff. 25-123. + XV. P5
- 2822 (Par. 9 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. S ff. 1-165. XV. P9
- Coistlin 354* (probably C Ernesti-Hermann) Pl. Nub. Proleg. S ff. 1-92. XV. P2
- 2827 (G Blaydes = Par. Dübner) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. S ff. 11-99. + XV. P14
- 2716 (Par. 6 Blaydes) Eq. Nub. Ran. S ff. 1-107. XV. XVI. P6
- 2718 Pl. Nub. M ff. 17-86. + XV. XVI. P7
- 2902 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Schol. S ff. 27-118. + XV. XVI. P17
- 2715 (B) Eq. Ach. Av. Vesp. Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-1097, 1237-end), Ec. (1-1135), Pax (1-947, 1012-1300). M ff. 1-219. XVI. B
- 2717 (C) Eq. Ach. Vesp. Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Pax (1-947, 1012-1354, 1357), Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-1097, 1237-end). Proleg. Arg.—Schol. Gloss. on Pl. (1-381). Occasional Schol. Gloss. elsewhere. M ff. 1-480. XVI. C
- 2923 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Schol. S ff. 1-119. + XVI. P10

2824	Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Schol. S ff. 1-128. + XVI.	P11
2825	Pl. (defective), Nub. S ff. 1-40. XVI.	P12
2826	Pl. Nub. Proleg. S ff. 1-105. XVI.	P13
2828	Pl. Nub. S ff. 1-122. + XVI.	P15
2829	Pl. S ff. 1-48. + XVI.	P16
2830	Pl. Schol. S ff. 1-76. XVI (1515).	P23
Supplement 58	Pl. Nub. (defective). S ff. 1-15. + XVI.	P18
Supplement 97	Pl. Nub. Schol. S ff. 1-126. + XVI.	P24
Supplement 499	Pl. Nub. S ff. 1-51. XVIII.	P21

SUPPLEMENTARY

985	Extract from Pl. S ff. 1-3. XV.	P26
Supplement 1247	Sententiae Pl. Nub. Proleg. M ff. 35-146. XVI.	P27
Supplement 395	"Scholia et castigationes in Aristophanis comedias." M ff. 1-173. XVII.	P28
2644	Tzetzes <i>De comoedia</i> . S ff. 233-234. + XIV.	P29
2677	Tzetzes <i>De comoedia</i> . M ff. 92-94. + XVI.	P30

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

ELBING

Stadtbibliothek

<i>Cod. Elbingensis</i> (Elb.)	Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. + El
--------------------------------	---

HAMBURG

Stadtbibliothek

SUPPLEMENTARY

40	Schol. on Lys. Arg. M ff. 108-111. + XVII. (Copy of Baroccianus 38)	Hm.
----	---	-----

MUNICH

Königliche Hof- und Staatsbibliothek

137	(N von Velsen=M Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Ec. Proleg. Arg. M ff. 1-105. + XV.	Mu1
492	(G von Velsen=N Blaydes) Thesm. Lys. Arg. to Lys. S ff. 1-39. + XV.	Mu2
89	Nub. (1-188). ff. 103-120. + XV.	Mu3
533	Pl. (1-203). ff. 23-26. + XV. XVI.	Mu4

SUPPLEMENTARY

182	Arg. to Ach. Eq.—Collectanea of Politian on Ach. Eq. ff. 90-106. + XV.	Mu5
-----	--	-----

TÜBINGEN

Universitätsbibliothek

Mb 32	(Tub.) Pl. Nub. (1-144) ff. 1-156. XV.	Tb
-------	--	----

VIENNA

Hofbibliothek

<i>XCV</i> Pl. (the opening verses). f. 134. +	W2
<i>CLXIII</i> (W Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. (1-675). Schol.	W
<i>CXCIII</i> Pl. Nub. Rare Schol. ff. 1-105.	W3
<i>CCIV</i> Pl. Nub. ff. 1-110.	W4
<i>CCX</i> (Y Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-155.	Y
<i>CCXIX</i> Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. +	W5
<i>CCXXVII</i> (Z Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 1-141.	Z
<i>CCXLIX</i> Pl. Nub. ff. 1-112.	W6
<i>CCLVII</i> Pl. Nub. +	W7

SUPPLEMENTARY

<i>CCLXXXIX</i> Extracts from the comedies. +	W8
---	----

GREECE

ATHENS

Ἑθνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη

1062 Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss on Pl. <i>S</i> + XVI.	At1
1063 Pl. Gloss. <i>S</i> + XVII (1628).	At2
1131 Pl. Nub. <i>S</i> + XVIII.	At3
1133 Pl. <i>S</i> + XVIII (1740).	At4

MOUNT PELION (MELIAE)

SUPPLEMENTARY

88 Ἀριστοφάνους Ἐξήγησις τῆς δευτέρας κωμωδίας. <i>S</i> ff. 143-153. + XVIII.	MP
--	----

HOLLAND

LEEWARDEN

Library of the Province of Friesland

34 Pl. Nub. Proleg.—Schol. on Nub. <i>S</i> ff. 1-94. + XVI.	Lw
--	----

LEYDEN

University Library

52 (<i>Cod. Vossianus</i> 77) (Voss. Dindorf=L Dübner) Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-1034). Schol. Gloss. <i>M</i> ff. 1-11. XIV.	
52 (<i>Cod. Vossianus</i> 191) (V Dobree) Av. (1492-1765). Schol. Gloss. <i>M</i> ff. 12-15. XIV. (Now bound with the foregoing. See <i>Cod. Laur.</i> XXXI. 15.)	F
34 (<i>XVIII.</i> 61. C) (C. LB Hemsterhuis=L Ernesti-Hermann) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. <i>S</i> ff. 1-125. XV.	Ld4

SUPPLEMENTARY

23 (<i>Cod. Vossianus</i>) Schol. on Lys. ff. 1-13.	Ld7
35 (<i>XVIII.</i> 74. D) Schol. on Lys. <i>S</i> ff. 1-38.	Ld8

ITALY

BOLOGNA

Biblioteca dell' Università

1766 Pl. S ff. 60-106. + XVI. Bl

CREMONA

Biblioteca Governativa

171 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. S ff. 1-144. XIV. XV. Cr

FERRARA

Biblioteca Comunale

113 Pl. (bis), Nub. (bis). Proleg. Arg. Schol. S ff. 1-223. XV Fr1
(1419).

247 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Rare Schol. on Pl.—Rare Gloss.
on Pl. and Nub. S ff. 102-292. + XV. Fr2

253 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-93. + XV. Fr3

FLORENCE

Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana

LX. 9 Av. (1393-1453). Schol. X. (Palimpsest fragment. See
Hermes XXVI (1891), pp. 128-136.)

XXXI. 15 (Γ) Ach. Ec. Eq. Av. (1-1419), Vesp. (421-1396, 1494-end),
Pax (378-490, 548-837, 893-947, 1012-1126, 1190-1300). Arg.
Schol. Gloss. M ff. 67-162. + XIV. Γ

XXXI. 13 (X Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S
ff. 1-124. XIV. X

XXXI. 22 (Ψ Blaydes) Nub. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-50. XIV. Ψ

66 (A F 2715) (Φ Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. S ff. 1-39. + XIV. Φ

140 (A F 2779) (Θ) Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. S ff.
1-185. XIV. Θ

XXXI. 16 (Δ) Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Ach. Av. Vesp. Lys. (1-61, 132-
199, 268-819, 890-1097, 1237-end). Arg. S ff. 1-259. XV. Δ

XXXI. 4 Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-
191. XV. Π

XXXI. 19 (Ξ Blaydes) Pl. S ff. 1-46. XV. Ξ

LXXX. 26 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 13-180. +
XV. F1

XXXI. 36. Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-106. XV. F2

XCI. 7 Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Rare Schol. on Nub.
S ff. 1-167. XV (1485). F3

97 (A F 2714) Nub. Gloss. S ff. 34-85. + XV. F4

607 (MN 88. 57) (Σ Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Arg. to Nub. S ff. 1-104.
XV. Σ

XXXI. 35 (Q Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-146.

XV. XVI.

83 (A F 2662) Pl. (1-192). M ff. 34-61. + XVI.

2

F5

SUPPLEMENTARY

164 (C 323) Sententiae. M A few ff. + XVI.

F6

Biblioteca Riccardiana

36 (K. II. 22) Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Arg. to Nub. M ff. 1-116. + XV.

F8

48 (K. II. 23 and 24) Ran. Pl. Schol. Gloss. to Pl. ff. 1-80, 81-108. XVI and XV. (Two manuscripts in one.)

F9

57 (S. II. 29) Nub. (defective). S ff. 1-32. + XVI.

F10

61 Pl. (1-11, 51-500). S ff. 1-29. XVI.

F11

SUPPLEMENTARY

78 Extracts (Pl. 146, 1151). S f. 68. + XV.

F12

22 (K. I. 26) Extract (Pl. 200, 201). M Fly-leaf. + XVI.

F13

MILAN

Biblioteca Ambrosiana

C 222 inf. (Med. 4 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. —Arg. to Eq. Av. M ff. 43-108. + XIII.

M4

L 39 sup. (M) Pl. Nub. Eq. Av. (1-1641). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 89-231. + XIV.

M

L 41 sup. (Med. 9 Blaydes=N Neil) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Ach. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-285. XV.

M9

D 64 sup. (Med. 5 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-125. XV.

M5

F 40 sup. Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Proleg. Arg. Schol. ff. 19-208. + XV.

M11

A 65 sup. (Med. 1 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. S XV.

M1

A 100 sup. (Med. 3 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-98. XV.

M3

O 72 sup. (Med. 10 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. (752-1055). Rare Schol. Gloss. ff. 61-82. + XV.

M10

A 97 sup. (Med. 2 Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. S XVI.

M2

I 109 inf. (Med. 7 Blaydes) Pl. Schol. M ff. 1-101. XVI. XVII.

M7

SUPPLEMENTARY

Z 165 sup. Eclogae Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Ach. Av. S ff. 1-32. XV.

M12

F 30 sup. Num. 2. (Med. 6 Blaydes) Schol. on Lys. Arg. S + XV.

M6

MODENA

Biblioteca Estense

- III D 8* Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. (1-220, 662-end), Ach. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-230. XV. E
III D 14 Ran. Eq. Av. Ach. Arg. Schol. (rare), Gloss. S ff. 1-235. XV. E2
III B 1 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-136. XV. E3
III A 14 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-98. XV. E4
III A 3 Pl. (218-end), Nub. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-69. XV. E5
III A 13 Pl. Nub. (50-end). Schol. (rare), Gloss. S ff. 1-114. XV. E6

SUPPLEMENTARY

- III C 14* Schol. on Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Metra. S ff. 19-80, 99-112. + XV. E7
III A 17 Schol. on Pl. Nub. (1-240). Proleg. Arg. S ff. 29-91. + XV. E8

NAPLES

Biblioteca Nazionale

- 179 (II F 22)* Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-77, 83, 84. + XIV. Np1
184 (II F 27) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-60. XIV. Np2
180 (II F 23) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. S ff. 29-183. + XV. Np3
181 (II F 24) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg.—Schol. (rare) on Pl. S ff. 1-137. XV (1485). Np4
182 (II F 25) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-160. XV. Np5
183 (II F 26) Pl. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. S ff. 1-42. XV. Np6

PARMA

Biblioteca Palatina

- 260* Pl. (1-647). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 43-66. + XV. XVI. Pa

PERUGIA

Biblioteca Comunale

- H 56* Ran. Ec. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-88. + XV. Pel
I 106 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-63. XV (1473). Pe2

SUPPLEMENTARY

- I 62* Sententiae. S ff. 76, 77. + XV. Pe3

RAVENNA

Biblioteca Classense

- 137, 4, A (R)* Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Eq. Pax. Lys. Ach. Vesp. Thesm. Ec. Arg. Schol. Gloss. M ff. 1-191. XI. R

ROME

*Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**Codices Vaticani*

- 920 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1 sq. + XIII.
XIV. Vv1
57 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 25 sq. + XIV. Vv2
61 Nub. (1410-end), Ran. Arg. Schol. ff. 1 sq. + XIV. Vv3
918 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-160. XIV
(1362). Vv4
1294 (Vat. Zacher) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. (1-270). Proleg. Arg. Schol.
Gloss. M ff. 1-111. + XIV. Vv5
59 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-107. + XV. Vv6
60 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1 sq. XV. Vv7
917 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-177. XV. Vv8
919 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-167. XV. Vv9
921 Pl. Ran. Arg. Gloss. ff. 1-107. XV. Vv10
1371 Pl. Arg. ff. 126-162. + XV. Vv11
1378 Ran. Arg. Schol. ff. 150 sq. + XV. Vv12
35 Ran. Schol. ff. 253 sq. + XV. Vv13
37 Pl. Nub. Schol. Gloss. ff. 192 sq. + Vv14

SUPPLEMENTARY

- 1463 Schol. on Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. ff. 81-102. + XV. Vv15
62 Tzetzes *De comoedia*. ff. 108 sq. + XVI. Vv16

Codices Barberiniani

- I 45 Ach. Ec. (1-1135), Eq. Arg. Rare Gloss. S ff. 1-95, 100-158.
XV. Vb1
I 46 Pl. Nub. Eq. Ran. Proleg. Arg. ff. 1-139. XV. Vb2
I 126 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Schol. ff. 1-73. XV. Vb3
I 148 Pl. (1-60). Gloss. ff. 1-7. XVI. Vb4
I 77 Pl. ff. 1-28. XVII. Vb5
I 110 Pl. ff. 1-40. + XVII. Vb6

SUPPLEMENTARY

- I 4 Sententiae Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 49-54. + XV. Vb7

Codices Palatini

- 116 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 23-140. +
XIV. Vp1
67 (P Müller=Vat. Küster) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Ach. Vesp. Av. Pax.
(1-947, 1012-1354, 1357), Lys. (1-61, 132-199, 268-819, 890-
1097, 1237-end). Arg.—Rare Schol. Gloss. on Eq. Ach. (1-
102). M ff. 1-234. XV. Vp2
128 (P von Velsen, Zacher) Eq. Ach. Vesp. Arg. to Ach. Vesp.
Aves. S ff. 91-185. + XV. Vp3

- 240 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Gloss. Rare Schol. S ff. 1-104. XV. Vp4
 289 Pl. Nub. S ff. 1-35, 41-84. XV. Vp5
 293 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. M ff. 16-82. + XV. Vp6
 321 Pl. M ff. 1-47. XV. Vp7
 324 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. M ff. 1-98. + XV. Vp8
 363 Pl. ff. 317-320. + XV. Vp9
 223 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 8-188. + XV
 (1495). Vp10
 319 Pl. (1-285, 594-961), Ran. (703-1195), Eq. (640-1205), Nub. (823-
 1106). M ff. 53-94. XV. XVI. Vp11

Codices Ottoboniani

- 166 Pl. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 5-34. + XV. Vo1
 161 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. S ff. 1-146. XV. XVI. Vo2
 181 Pl. Nub. Proleg.—Arg. to Nub.—Rare Schol. Gloss. on Pl.
 S ff. 5-82. + XVI. Vo3
 210 Pl. Nub. (1-1466). S ff. 168-274. + XVI. Vo4
 346 Pl. Nub. Proleg.—Arg. to Nub. S ff. 1-70. + XVI. Vo5
 385 Pl. S ff. 1-13. + XVI. Vo6
 307 Pl. S ff. 1-50. + XVII. Vo7

Codices Urbinates

- 141 (U) (Vat. U Küster) Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Proleg. Arg. Schol.
 Gloss. S ff. 78-190. + XIV. U
 143 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-141. XIV. XV. U2

Codices Reginae Suecorum

- 147 Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-100. + XIV. Vs1
 161 Pl. Proleg. Arg. S ff. 1-32. XV. Vs2

SUPPLEMENTARY

- 142 A few sententiae on a folio preceding the MS. S XVI. Vs3

Biblioteca Vallicelliana

- F 16 Ach. (691-930). Schol. Gloss. S ff. 53-60. + XV. Rm1
 F 25 Pl. (1-80, 82-207). Gloss. ff. 64-70. + XVI. Rm2

SUPPLEMENTARY

- E 21 Florilegium. A few extracts. + XVI. Rm3

Archivio di San Pietro

- C 152 Pl. (206-end), Nub. Schol. Gloss. S + XVII (1620). Rm4

TURIN

Biblioteca Nazionale

- B VI 18 (36) Pl. Rare Gloss. S ff. 1-51. + XV, XVI. To1

SUPPLEMENTARY

- B V 33 Extracts from Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 284-286. + To2

- B V 34 Extracts from Schol. on Eq. Pl. Nub. Ran. Av. Vesp. Proleg.—Arg. to Ran. S ff. 90-93, 98-123, 136-137, 146-156. + XVI. To3

VENICE

Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco

- 474 (V) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Pax, Vesp. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. M ff. 1-172. XII. V
 472 (T Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-91. + XIV. V2
 473 (U Pl. Nub. Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-81. XIV. V3
Supplem. XIV (Cl. IX) Pl. Nub. (24-end). Proleg. Arg. Schol. S ff. 40-149. XIV. V4
 475 (G, but S or G Blaydes) Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. Av. Pax, Vesp. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. P ff. 1-153. + XV. (Copy of 474) G
Append. 613 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. ff. 1-103. XVI. V5
Supplem. XXVI (Cl. IX) Pl. (392-end), Nub. (1-1341), Ran. (78-1167). Arg. to Nub.—Schol. Gloss. ff. 1-106. V6

VERONA

Biblioteca Capitolare

- CXXXI (120) Pl. Nub. Ran. Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-131. XV. Ve

RUSSIA

MOSCOW

Library of the Holy Synod

- 311 (298 *Matthaei*) Pl. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 76-136. + XVII. Mo1
 238 (225 *Matthaei*) Ran. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-56. + XVII. Mo2

SPAIN

ESCURIAL

Biblioteca del Escorial

- Φ III 6 Pl. Nub. Ran. Arg. Gloss. ff. 1-112. XV. Es1
 Y III 16 Pl. Nub. Ran. Schol. ff. 1-196. XV. Es2
 Ω IV 7 Ran. Gloss. ff. 104-165. + XV. Es3

SUPPLEMENTARY

- X I 13. Extracts Pl. Nub. Ran. ff. 317-319, 328. + XIV. Es4

MADRID

Biblioteca Nacional

- N 53 Pl. Nub. Ran. Eq. (1-308). Proleg. Arg. Schol. Gloss. S ff. 1-85. + XIV. XV. Md1
 N 47 Pl. S ff. 187-205. + XV. Md2

SUPPLEMENTARY

N 72 Sententiae. *S* + XV. Md3

N 67 Proleg. Arg.—Schol. on Pl. Nub. *S* ff. 21-34, 36-43. + XV. Md4

SALAMANCA

Biblioteca de la Universidad

1-2-5 Nub. Ran. Pl. (1-30, 253-end). + XVI. Sa1

1-2-14 Pl. Nub. Ran. (1-607). Arg. to Nub. Ran. ff. 1-139. XVI. Sa2

1-2-10 Pl. Nub. Proleg. Arg. + XVI. Sa3

TURKEY

ATHOS (MOUNT ATHOS)

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Ἐηροποτάμου

93 Nub. (defective). Gloss. *S* + XVI. MA1

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Ἰβήρων

144 Pl. (317-end), Nub. (1-1316). Schol. Gloss. *S* ff. 1-98. XV. MA2

SUPPLEMENTARY

1317 Arg. *S* + XVIII. MA3

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Καρακάλλου

62 Pl. Nub. *S* + XVIII. MA4

Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Μονῆς Γρηγορίου

101 Pl. (defective). *S* + XVII. MA5

CONSTANTINOPLE

Βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Μετοχίου τοῦ Παραγίου Τάφου

143 Pl. Schol. *S* ff. 403-438. + XVII. Cn

JERUSALEM

Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη

II 424 Nub. ff. 1-43. + XVII. J1

I 394 Pl. *S* + XVII. XVIII. J2

II 462 Pl. ff. 330-356. + XVIII (1732). J3

II 463 Nub. + XVIII. J4

MOUNT SINAI

Library of the Monastery

1206 Ran. (1-822). Arg. *S* + XV. Ms

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

AN UNRECOGNIZED CONSTRUCTION OF THE LATIN
SUBJUNCTIVE: THE SECOND PERSON SINGULAR
IN GENERAL STATEMENTS OF FACT

BY WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

My paper deals with such Subjunctives as the independent ones in the familiar passages:

- A. Nil satis est, inquit, quia tanti quantum habeas *sis*; Hor. *Sat.* i. 1. 62.
- B. Assem habeas, assem *valeas*; Petron. 77.
- C. Ubi mortuos *sis*, ita *sis* ut nomen cluet; Plaut. *Trin.* 496.
- D. Quom inopiast, *cupias*: quando eius copia, tum non *velis*; Plaut. *Trin.* 671.
- E. Quod in manu teneas atque oculis videas, id *desideres*; Plaut. *Trin.* 914.
- F. Unum quom noris, omnis *noris*; Ter. *Ph.* 265.
- G. Accipe nunc, victus tenuis quae quantaque secum Adferat. In primis *valeas* bene; Hor. *Sat.* ii. 2. 70.
- H. Dum tibi fit quod placeat, ille ringitur: tu *rideas*, Prior *bibas*, prior *decumbas*; Ter. *Ph.* 341.
- I. Nam cetera maleficia tum *persequare*, ubi facta sunt, hoc, nisi provideris ne accidat, ubi evenit, frustra iudicia *implores*; Sall. *Cat.* 52.4.
- J. Quem neque gloria neque pericula excitant, nequiquam *hortere*; timor animi auribus officit; Sall. *Cat.* 58. 2.
- K. Nec porro quaecumque aevo macieque senescunt, Nec, mare quae independent, vesco sale saxa peresa Quid quoque amittant in tempore cernere *possis*; Lucr. i. 325.
- L. Quae si ipse exsequi nequeas, *possis* tamen Scipioni praecipere et Laelio ("a Scipio and a Laelius"); Cic. *Sen.* 9. 28.

These look alike. If there were a comfortable category in the grammars into which to put them all, one would not think of separating them.

As the title of the paper implies, I am brought to regard such Subjunctives as expressing general statements of fact,—as corresponding, in effect, to *Indicatives* in the same second person singular indefinite. I wish to translate example A by, "because you

are worth just what you possess ;" B by, "have a penny, you are worth a penny ;" C by, "when you are dead, dead you are," etc. In accordance with this view, § 542 of the Hale-Buck *Grammar* reads: "A general statement of fact is sometimes expressed by a Subjunctive of the Second Person Singular Indefinite;" and to our example C, there given, is added the statement, "the second *sis* has the force of *es*."

The construction itself will prove to be a simple one to solve, but the exhibition of previous opinion upon the matter must be a somewhat tangled affair, since grammars, grammatical treatises, notes in commentaries written by professional grammarians, and notes by commentators who are not professional grammarians, have all to be taken into the account. It is also obviously impracticable to refer to every note ever written upon any of these passages. The selections, however, will fairly cover the ground.

So far as I know, no grammar or grammatical paper had recognized the existence of the construction for which I am contending. The statements regularly made (where any are made) with regard to the range of the Subjunctive of the second person singular indefinite are of a kind to exclude such an interpretation. Thus Madvig, §370, says: "Diese Form findet sich in bedingter Rede, in hypothetischen Aussagen und in Fragen über das, was geschehen wird und kann, in Nebensätzen mit Conjunctionen, in Relativsätzen (mit *qui* oder einem unbestimmten Relativ), und in Vorschriften und Verboten." To this is added the *Anmerkung*: "Ein solcher conjunctivischer Bedingungssatz führt nicht den Conjunctiv im Hauptsatze herbei." Quite recently (1905), Nutting, *Studies in the Si-Clause*, pp. 84, 85, has distinctly shown the conviction that there is no Subjunctive in a main sentence corresponding to the common second singular indefinite in subordinate clauses. "One looks in vain," he says, "for a clear case of such leveling in Plautus." And Elmer, in his note on F (as will be seen below), in effect says that a general statement of fact in the second singular indefinite *must* be expressed by the Indicative.

The grammarians of course all provide for the Subjunctive second person singular indefinite in conditional or corresponding relative clauses which, if in any other person or number, would be

in the Indicative, as in *memoria minuitur, nisi eam exerceas*, Cic. *Sen.* 7. 21; but they know nothing of the power for which this paper contends. If anywhere they chance to make use of an example of the type before us, it is placed under some already recognized and entirely different category, as we shall see below.

Whatever the grammarians may do, the commentators, it would seem, would frequently have occasion to discuss such examples. The most striking feature of the case is, however, that they generally pass them without comment. Sometimes, indeed, they actually give an explanation of the dependent verb in such combinations, and pass in silence the far more difficult independent one. Thus Greenough, in his edition of the *De senectute* (1873 and in various reprints), says of our example L, "*si . . . nequeas*, gen. cond. (§309 a)," but says nothing of *possis*. Occasionally the dependent verb and the main verb are dealt with together and without distinction, with a reference to some rule, such as the grammars afford. This reference, as is natural under the circumstances, never fits. Thus Gudeman, dealing with example I in his edition of Sallust, says, "*persequare . . . provideris . . . implores*: Subjunctive of indefinite second person singular," and refers to the Allen and Greenough *Grammar*, § 266a. This section, when one turns to it, proves to deal with *independent* "Hortatory" Subjunctives, and to read (266), "The Hortatory Subjunctive is used to express an exhortation, a command, a concession, or a condition;" and (a), "The Second Person is used only of an indefinite subject, except in prohibition, in early Latin, and in poetry." Not only the general headings "independent" and "hortatory," but the examples given (e. g., *isto bono utare dum adsit*, Cic. *Sen.* 10. 33), show the type meant. But *nisi provideris* is evidently not independent; and it is also difficult to believe that Sallust means to *direct* people to implore in vain, unless, indeed, the editor conceives the idiom to be one of *ironical* command (not provided for in the reference), in which case the explanation should certainly be given. More frequently, if anything at all is said about the main Subjunctive, it is simply classed with the dependent one, and the Subjunctive idiom in the second singular indefinite in "conditional" clauses is referred to

or assumed. Thus Munro, in his comment upon our example K, puts *possis* with *si non relinquo*, Lucr. i. 515, *quibus careas*, ii. 4, etc. Thus, again, Greenough, in the note in his edition of the *Satires and Epistles* of Horace, 1888, says of our example A, "*tanti sis* (*you are rated at*), etc. The subjunctive is the regular one of the second person with indefinite subject." But in his *Grammar* Greenough (the same is true of his revisers) makes no provision for an independent Subjunctive of the second person singular indefinite, except as hortatory or potential; while the treatment of the *dependent* member of the example in question comes in § 309 *a* (518 of the new edition) under the head of "General Conditions," to which it is obvious that *sis* does not belong. It is clear, also, that general conditions are really meant; for the rule reads: "The Subjunctive is sometimes used in the second person singular to denote the act of an indefinite Subject (*you = any one*). Here the Indicative of a general truth may stand in the apodosis."¹

Yet the tendency naturally produced by the sight of the combination of dependent and independent Subjunctives in the same indefinite second person is a good one, and has in a number of instances led, even in the absence of an admitted grammatical category, to the sound interpretation. Thus Wagner, in the note in his *Trinummus* (1875) upon our example E, says, "*id desideres*, 'that one is apt to forget': the second person subjunctive expresses generality." Greenough (1888), as we have seen, translates *tanti sis* of A by "*you are rated*." Friedländer, in his *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis* (1891) translates our example B by "*Glaubt mir, habe einen As, so giltst du einen As*." Morris, in his edition of the *Captivi and Trinummus* of Plautus (1898), paraphrasing example C, says, "when you are dead, you are dead in the full sense of the term." He makes no grammatical comment. Rolfe, in his edition of the *Satires and Epistles* of Horace

¹ The word "sometimes" is not happy. The Subjunctive is regularly used, there being but a very small number of exceptions in the whole range of the literature. Hardly any usage in Latin is more fixed. Or, if the intended meaning is "one sometimes finds examples of . . .," then, by the same token, the word "sometimes" ought to be added to every rule in the Grammar. Moreover, the phrase "may stand" in the last line should read "generally stands."

(1902) puts the main and subordinate clauses in example A together, rightly translating, "because you are rated by the amount of your possessions," and adding, "*habeas* and *sis* are subjunctive because of the indefinite second person singular." No grammatical reference is given. The procedure of Wagner, Greenough, Friedländer, Morris, and Rolfe seems to imply a subconsciousness of the force naturally to be attributed to the independent construction; but these excellent opportunities which Greenough and Morris, as grammarians, had for calling attention to a much misunderstood, and very variously interpreted, construction, and of enunciating its true character, pass unused. Note also, under 4 below, p. 27, a discordant explanation of the exactly similar *persequare* of example I (namely as Potential) in the Greenough and Daniell Sallust.

The only comment I have noticed which makes a sound explicit statement about the independent construction is that of Schütz (1881), who, in his note upon our passage A, says "*sis*, nicht *es*, weil allgemein, nicht an H. direct gerichtet; 'man gilt.'" To this he adds, "Im Indicativ würde man eher die 1. Person verlangen, weil der Geizige doch sich selbst damit entschuldigen will." He is right in his general feeling, but not right in implying that in the second singular indefinite the Indicative could not be used. See below, at the end of this paper.

The explanations which clearly attempt to bring one or another of the independent Subjunctives in sentences A-L under one or another of the categories provided for in the grammars are of six kinds. I shall first merely state them, without argument.

1. The Subjunctive is that of the *Oratio Obliqua*. This is the favorite older explanation, and is still frequently found. Thus Wüsteman, revision of Heindorf (1843), says of our example A, "man bemerke den im Latein. gewöhnlichen Übergang von der *orat. recta* in die *obliqua*;" H. Dantzer (1869) says "*sis*, Übergang in die abhängige Rede;" Kirchner (1885) says "im Lateinischen geht die Rede aus der directen Construction (*nihil satis est*) in die abhängige (*quia tanti . . . sis*) über, was auch in Prosa nicht selten vorkommt;" and G. T. A. Krüger in various editions (as in 1860 and 1866), by a still bolder device,

says "*sis*, statt *es*, als wäre vorhergegangen: *nīl satis esse ait*. Also auf einer Anakoluthie beruhend." G. Krüger says the same, in re-editing his father's edition in 1876. Among the later editors, Kiessling (1886) says the same in the sentence, "der Konjunktiv *sis* = *esse putaris*." Palmer (my edition is of 1888) seems to mean the same by his phrase "general opinion" in saying, "the subjunctive *sis* is used because it is the general opinion, indefinite." And Harper's *Lexicon* (1879) means the same, in putting example A under the Subjunctive illustration of the statement, "construed with indicative in asserting a fact; with subjunctive in stating an assumed reason, or one entertained by another mind."

2. The Subjunctive is that of Command or Exhortation ("Imperative"). Thus Blase, in his recently published "*Tempora u. Modi*" in the *Historische Grammatik d. lat. Sprache*, p. 136, puts our D as his first example under the head of the Jussive, Hortative, or (true) Optative, and accounts for *non* as modifying, not the sentence as a whole, but the single word *velis*. The same explanation seems to be meant, p. 123, for C, which is translated by "so bald man tot ist, soll man es ganz sein." And the same is explicitly suggested by Antoine and Lallier as possible for I. See below, at the end of 4.

3. The Subjunctive is Permissive. Thus Elmer, on example H, says, "*rideas, bibas*, etc.: subj. of permission, involving the yielding of somebody's will; to be carefully distinguished from the potential."

4. The Subjunctive is Potential. It is by the Potential formula ("you can laugh, drink your wine before him," etc.) that Morris H. Morgan, in his translation of the *Phormio* (1904), renders these same Subjunctives which Elmer tells us are "to be carefully distinguished from the potential." The express word "Potential" is used of one or another of our examples by many commentators. Thus Dillenburger (my edition is of 1867) both affirms this explanation and denies 1 above, in the note: "*sis non per anacoluthiam positum est pro es, quasi praecederet nīl satis esse ait, quia*, sed est potentialis modus, ut apud Lucilium." Likewise G. Krüger, who in the edition of 1876 explained *sis* in A as due to

Oratio Obliqua, explains it in the edition of 1889 as Potential. This same explanation is given by Lucian Müller (1891) for A and B, by Blase *op. cit.*, p. 142, for B, by Schütz *op. cit.* for G, and by Schmalz *Bell. Cat.* (my edition is of 1885) for J.

Unfortunately this word "Potential," as used in our grammars, is ambiguous. It includes meanings so far apart, at their extremes, as "may possibly" or "can," and "would certainly." The former idea alone should bear the name Potential, while the other (seen most easily in the common Subjunctive conclusion) should bear some name like that of Ideal Certainty, which I have given it in my own grammatical writing.¹ It is the true Potential use, apparently, that Krüger and Müller have in mind, and likewise Freeman and Sloman upon our example D. This, at any rate, is what is meant by Greenough and Daniell in their Sallust, in the note upon *persequare* in our example I. The translation given is "one may prosecute," and the reference (Allen and Greenough *Grammar* 311a) is to the statement, "The Potential Subjunctive is used to denote an action not as actually performed, but as possible." Similarly Antoine and Lallier, *Salluste, Conjuration de Catilina* (1888), write in their commentary: "*persequare* pourrait être un subjonctif impératif, puisque le sujet est indéterminé; mais en réalité, comme le note M. P. Thomas, c'est le subjonctif potentiel: 'on peut ne les poursuivre que lorsqu'ils sont accomplis.'"

5. The Subjunctive is that of Ideal Certainty. This is doubtless what Roby means in placing our example J under the "hypothetical Subjunctive," § 1544 (cf. § 1528 and 3). The corresponding English for our examples would then be "one would." This is also substantially what Kiessling means in saying, upon example G, "*valeas*, Konj. der gemilderten Behauptung, *ὑγιαίνεις ἄν*," L. Müller in saying, upon the same example, "*valeas*; wie oft in Satiren und Episteln, urbane Milderung der Behauptung," Heinze, new edition (1906) of Kiessling's *Satires* of Horace, in saying, "*valeas* scil. si parvo vivas," Rolfe *op. cit.*, in saying, "*valeas*: potential subjunctive with an implied protasis, *si tenui*

¹Delbrück *Verg. Syntax* II, p. 371, and Brugmann *Kurze vergl. Gramm.* II, p. 384, while accepting my term, have misunderstood my meaning.

victu utaris," Palmer *op. cit.*, in saying, "*valeas*, a potential or modified future," Wickham *Satires, Epistles, and De arte poetica* of Horace, 1891, in saying, "*valeas*, potential," and Bennett *Cato Maior*, 1897, in his note upon L, "if you should be unable to practice this." This must likewise be what Wickham had in mind in saying of A, "the mood is probably the same as in the original, 'sis' = $\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \epsilon\iota\eta\varsigma$;" though I fancy that this is a restored original, not a known one. And this is also probably what Heinze means, *op. cit.*, in saying of the same example, "der *potentiale Konjunktivis* wie bei Petron. 77 *assem habeas assem valeas*." (It will be noticed that Heinze has abandoned Kiessling's explanation.)

6. The independent verb of example F, *unum quom noris, omnis noris*, is explained by at least two of the commentators as not a Subjunctive at all, but an Indicative of the future perfect. Thus Dziatzko says, "*noris* ist beidemal Fut. exact;" and Elmer gives the same view, with the reasoning which brings him to it, as follows; "*noris*: in both cases fut. perf. ind. equivalent to fut. If the first *noris* were the perf. subj. of an indefinite second person, we should have *omnis novisti*, instead of *omnis noris*."

The error of procedure in all these explanations is of a kind that shows itself again and again in the history of grammatical study. Those who have dealt with one or another example of a type have, in repeated instances, explained the example which they had before them, without stopping to make a *collection* of examples sufficient in number to enable a scientific inference of any kind to be drawn. The perfect method is, first, to make a complete collection, and then to study every example, in the light of all. Human life being, however, what it is, one must, until our work is better organized, be content with a fairly large collection. In making this, one must throw aside grammatical prepossessions, and admit all examples that would naturally seem to belong together. Further, it would be worth while to look, at least, at any sentences that might be found, in which ideas of the same general kind seemed to be expressed, but by a different mechanism. Further, and without any doubt, as much of the context of the Subjunctive examples as could possibly be illuminating should be added for each. Here again our prevailing

method is sadly defective. In a number of examples of the type which we are studying, the context immediately and irresistibly overthrows the explanations given. The material being thus gathered, every explanation that might account for one or more of the mass of examples, but would not account for all, or that in any example would fail to fit the context, should be rejected. The result of this process in the present instance will be the overthrow of all six of the explanations given for the examples cited above.

Assuming this for the moment to be the case, the next step should be to seek for an explanation that will explain all the examples, and that will be in harmony with the context in all. If one is thereby brought to believe in the existence of a construction not recognized by the grammars, one need not be alarmed, if one has confidence in the dispassionateness of the procedure that has brought him to his conclusion.

Finally, one may properly seek for a probable origin of the usage thus reached, out of some construction or constructions known actually to exist. The two steps, however,—the establishment of the existence of a construction, and the search for its origin,—may be entirely disconnected. Failure to take the second step successfully will not of itself invalidate the first. A number of constructions are surely known to exist of which the origins are not surely known. In the present case, however, both steps can, I think, be securely taken.

In the collection which follows, the examples are arranged by groups of ideas, or for convenience in reference:

1. At bona pars hominum, decepta cupidine falso
 'Nil satis est,' inquit, 'quia tanti quantum habeas sis.'
 Quid facias illi? Iubeas miserum esse libenter
 Quatenus id facit. Hor. Sat. i. 1. 61.
2. Aurum adque ambitio specimen virtutis viriquest.
 Quantum habeas, tantum ipse sis tantique habearis; Lucil. Schol.
 ad Iuv. iii. 143.
3. Mirum quin tu illo tecum divitias feras.
 Ubi mortuos sis, ita sis ut nomen cluet; Plaut. Trin. 495.
4. Tarda sunt quae in commune expostulantur: privatam gratiam
 statim mereare, statim recipias; Tac. Ann. i. 28. 21.

5. Nam si velis quod nondum vetitum est, *timeas* ne vetere: at si prohibita impune transcenderis, neque metus ultra neque pudor est; Tac. *Ann.* iii. 54. 10.
6. Quid in amicitia fieri oportet, quae tota veritate perpenditur? In qua nisi, ut dicitur, apertum pectus videas tuumque ostendas, nihil exploratum *habeas*; Cic. *Am.* 26. 97.
7. Mediocriterne causis nocent, cum adversariorum adiumenta confirmant? Si, quae sunt in iis invidiosa, invidiosiora faciunt, quantum est in eo tandem mali? Quid, si contumeliosius invehere, nonne a te iudices *abalienes*? Quid, si non intellegas te in iudices invehi, mediocre peccatum est? Quid, si causam relinquas, nihilne *noceas*? In ipsis autem argumentis si quid posueris aperte falsum nihilne *noceas*? Cic. *De or.* ii. 75, 303-306.
8. Liber captivos avis ferae consimilis est:
Semel fugiendi si datast occasio, satis est,
Numquam postilla *possis* prendere; Plaut. *Capt.* 116.
9. Nulla potest oculorum acies contenta tueri,
Nec porro quae cumque aevo macieque senescunt,
Nec, mare quae inpendent, vesco sale saxa peresa
Quid quoque amittant in tempore cernere *possis*; Lucr. i. 324.
Similarly ii. 220, 763, 768; iii. 856, 1024; iv. 572, 1231; vi. 113.
Cf. the formulae *videre licet*, vi. 79; *licet cognoscere*, vi. 167, etc.
10. Hostes alienigenae aut oppressi serviunt aut recepti in amicitiam beneficio se obligatos putant: qui autem ex numero civium, dementia aliqua depravati, hostes patriae semel esse coeperunt, nec vi coercere nec beneficio placare *possis*; Cic. *Cat.* iv. 10. 22.
11. Sed tamen est decorus senis sermo quietus et remissus, facitque persaepe ipsa sibi audientiam diserti senis composita et mitis oratio. Quam si ipse exsequi nequeas, *possis* tamen Scipioni praecipere et Laelio; Cic. *Sen.* 9. 28.
12. Omnino si quicquam est decorum, nihil est profecto magis quam aequabilitas cum universae vitae, tum singularum actionum, quam conservare non *possis* (really an independent sentence) si aliorum naturam imitans omittas tuam; Cic. *Off.* i. 31. 111.
13. Ut non omnem frugem neque arborem in omni agro reperire *possis*, sic non omne facinus in omni vita nascitur; Cic. *Sex. Rosc.* 27. 75.
14. Matronae praeter faciem nil cernere *possis*,
Cetera, ni Catia est, demissa veste tegentis;
* * * * *
Altera nil obstat: Cois tibi paene videre est,
Ut nudam, ne crure malo, ne sit pede turpi;

Metiri *possis* oculo latus. An tibi mavis
 Insidias fieri pretiumque avellier ante
 Quam mercem ostendi? Hor. Sat. i. 2. 94, 95, and 101-105.

15. Vix credere *possis*
 Quam sibi non sit amicus; Hor. Sat. i. 2. 19.
16. Accipe nunc, victus tenuis quae quantaque secum
 Adferat. In primis *valeas* bene. Hor. Sat. ii. 2. 70.
17. Quanta cuiusque animo audacia natura aut moribus inest, tanta in
 bello patere solet. Quem neque gloria neque pericula excitant,
 nequiquam *hortere*; timor animi auribus officit; Sall. Cat. 58. 2.
18. Non votis neque suppliciis muliebribus auxilia deorum parantur:
 vigilando, agundo, bene consulundo prospera omnia cedunt: ubi
 socordiae te atque ignaviae tradideris, nequiquam deos *implores*:
 irati infestique sunt; Sall. Cat. 52. 29.
19. Nam cetera maleficia tum *persequare*, ubi facta sunt; hoc, nisi
 provideris ne accidat, ubi evenit, frustra iudicia *implores*: capta
 urbe nihil fit reliqui victis; Sall. Cat. 52. 4.
20. Siquoi mutuom quid dederis, fit pro proprio perditum:
 Quom repetas, inimicum amicum *invenias* beneficio tuo; Plaut.
 Trin. 1051.
21. Neque ego homines magis asinos numquam vidi: ita plagis costae
 callent:
 Quos quom ferias, tibi plus *noceas*. Eo enim ingenio hi sunt fla-
 gritribae,
 * * * * *
 At faciem quom aspicias eorum, hau mali videntur; Plaut. Pseud. 136.
22. Sed eccum incedit: at quom aspicias tristem, frugi *censeas*; Plaut.
 Cas. 562. Similarly cum . . . perventum est, tum *intellegas*; Cic.
 Div. ii. 21. 48.
23. Tene asymbolum venire unctum atque lautum e balineis,
 Otiosum ab animo, quom ille et cura et sumptu absumitur!
 Dum tibi fit quod placeat, ille ringitur: tu *rideas*,
 Prior *bibas*, prior *decumbas*; cena dubia adponitur; Ter. Ph. 339.
24. Abs quivis homine, quom est opus, beneficium accipere *gaudeas*;
 Verum enim vero id demum iuvat, si, quem aequomst facere, is bene
 facit; Ter. Ad. 254.
25. Minus placet magis quod suadetur: quod dissuadetur placet.
 Quom inopiast, *cupias*: quando eius copias, tum non *velis*; Trin.
 670.
26. CH. Vide modo ut hominem noveris. SY. Tamquam me: fieri
 istuc solet;
 Quod in manu teneas atque oculis videas, id *desideres*; Trin. 913.

27. Lippi illic oculi servos est simillumus.
Si non est, *nolis* esse neque *desideres* :
Si est, abstinere quin attingas non *queas* ; Plaut. *Bacch.* 913.
28. De mortuis loquor, qui nulli sunt; nos, qui sumus, num aut cornibus caremus aut pinnis? Ecquis id dixerit? Certe nemo. Quid ita? Quia, cum id non habeas quod tibi nec usu nec natura sit aptum, non *careas*, etiamsi sentias te non habere; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 36. 87.
29. Unum quom noris, omnis *noris* ; Ter. *Ph.* 265.
30. Licentiam *des* linguae, cum verum petas; Publil. 308. Similarly¹
10, 78, 81, 88, 117, 185, 232, 233, 252, 285, 331, 361, 382, 394, 427, 468,
512, 530, 592, 635, 645; also, in perf. Subj., 126, 364.
31. Assem habeas, assem *valeas* ; habes, habeberis; Petron. 77.²

We proceed to test, in the light of this collection, the explanations that have thus far been given for this and that example taken by itself.

1. The construction can not be that of the *Oratio Obliqua*. This explanation was forced, even in the case of the first example. To many of the others, it can not be applied at all. Thus 3 can not mean "you are thought to be dead," 4 "you are thought to receive at once," etc.

2. The Subjunctive can not be one of Command. Blase's explanation of *velis* in 25 seems to be due to a passing error of interpretation, and certainly can not be accepted. Even if it would there fit, however, it would not, by any stretching, fit in 1, 2, 32, and others. Lucilius, Horace, and Petronius do not mean to command a man *to be* worth just what he possesses.

The only possible theory that could make these constructions to be of "Jussive" origin would be that they began as ironical commands, like "cry for what you don't have," and (probably) the second verb in "go further and fare worse." But Blase presumably did not have this explanation in mind. And, in any case, it would be impossible, from such an origin, to account for the

¹ By the generally accepted readings. In a few cases, the MSS are divided.

² *Habes* is given in all of Bûcheler's editions as the reading of the single MS (Paris. 7989) which has this passage, and is reaffirmed by Bûcheler in a private letter. Omont has been good enough to report directly from the MS, to the same effect. The readings *habeas* and *habe*, respectively from the passage as repeated in Friedländer's notes (*habes* in his text) and the Segebade and Lommatzsch *Lexicon Petronianum*, are errors, as I am assured by Friedländer and Lommatzsch. But of course it is the *habeberis* that has value for the present purpose.

negative, except by supposing the construction to have lost every vestige of its initial feeling, and to have *become* a statement of fact. This would bring us to the actual force for which I am contending, though by a very improbable route.¹

3. The Subjunctive can not be Permissive. The independent Subjunctive, if expressing the idea at all, would express Permission granted by the speaker. Such can not be the meaning in the example (23) for which Elmer gives this explanation. But, even if it were, it would be impossible to find the force in 1, 2, 3, etc. The meaning of 3, e. g., can not be "when you are dead, you are permitted to be dead in fact."

4. The Subjunctive can not be Potential, in the true sense. The true Potential is, to be sure, common enough in the second person singular indefinite. It indicates what lies within one's power, or within the possibilities of one's experience. Thus in Liv. xxii. 50. 9, *cuneo quidem hoc laxum atque solutum agmen ut si nihil obstat disicias* means, "by the use of the wedge-formation it lies within one's power to split this loose and disorganized line as if there were nothing in the way" (cf. *πλησίον ἀλλήλων· καὶ κεν διοϊστεύσεως*, μ 102); and in Iuv. xiv. 41, *Catilinam quocumque in populo videas, quocumque sub axe* means "one may see (it lies within the possibilities of any man's experience to see) a Catiline in any nation, under any sky." It is also quite true that *persequare* of 19 might by itself be interpreted, with Greenough and Daniell, as Potential ("it lies within one's power to punish other ill deeds at once") and 4, with Blase, *op. cit.* p. 142, in a similar way. But such a translation would be forced for *frustra implores* (in the same passage, 19, with *persequare*), making it mean "it lies within one's power to implore in vain," or "one might perhaps implore in vain;" while it would be completely out of the question for such examples as 1, 2, and 3, making them mean "it lies within your power to be worth as much as you possess," "it lies within your power to be dead in fact," etc.

A special word needs to be said with regard to the examples with *possis*. In such cases, the grammarians and commentators,

¹ In Plut. *περὶ φιλοπλουτίας* VII, p. 526 C, *κέρδαινε καὶ φείδου καὶ τοσοῦτον νόμιζε σαυτὸν ἄξιον, ὅσον ἂν ἔχῃς*, the advice is not ironical, but serious.

as Blase *op. cit.*, p. 142, upon our examples 8 and 9, and Munro upon 9, are too ready to give the explanation "Potential," confusing the meaning which the verb has in itself with the meaning of the mood employed in the particular instance. In *videas* of Verg. *Georg.* 1. 387, rightly cited by Blase in the same passage, the verb itself expresses the idea of seeing, while the *mood* conveys the idea of the possibility of that seeing. *Possis*, correspondingly, if the *mood* is to be really potential, would have to mean either "you have the power to have the power" or "it may possibly happen that you should have the power,"—meanings obviously out of the question here, and probably, in fact, nowhere occurring. It should be remembered, too, that by Roman idiom (apart from the usage which I am endeavoring to establish) the natural mood to use for *possum* in saying "one may" would be the Indicative, *potes*.

The only possible way in which to deal with *possis* by any of the categories hitherto recognized in our grammars would be by interpreting it as meaning "one would be able." This is the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty, to which we pass.

5. The construction can not be one of Ideal Certainty ("you would"). Such an explanation would, in the absence of any other, tolerably explain *valeas* of 16 ("you would in that case be well"), and might, with some forcing, be held to account for several of the examples with *possis*, and also for 17 ("it would be useless to urge"), and for 22 ("you would think him good for something"); but it would be unreasonable for 1, 2, 3, and many others. The natural meaning can not be "one would be worth what one should possess," etc. Still less reasonable would it be for 21. The speaker is actually flogging the slaves as he speaks. He is in no frame of mind to say, "if one *should* flog them, one would hurt one's self worse than them." And, finally, the explanation is obviously impossible for *rideas*, *bibas*, and *decumbas* of 23. The meaning can not be, "his face is drawn with anxiety; you would laugh, you would drink before him, you would take your place at table before him."

The same reasoning would destroy any theory that should resort to the modified form of the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty known as the "Subjunctive of Softened Assertion." This might,

though not without strain, be adopted for *velis* of 25 and *nolis* of 27 (making them correspond to *velim* and *nolim*), and in consequence be resorted to for *cupias* of 25, and even for *desideres* of 26 and 27. But it would not fit the equivalent of *desideres*, namely, *careas* of 28; and it obviously would be impossible to find such a meaning in any other of the examples.

6. The construction in all the examples except 29 is obviously not an Indicative one. Dziatzko and Elmer would therefore not be through with their difficulty after explaining the ambiguous form *noris* as a Future Perfect.

These six explanations are all that suggest themselves as possible to attempt, with the categories that we now have in the grammars. They prove to be insufficient. None of them will account for all the examples. Their extreme difficulty, and the unsatisfactoriness of the whole method of procedure, become very obvious, if one sums up one's impressions by recalling that different writers have given different explanations for the same examples, that the same writer has at different times given different explanations for the same example, that certain writers have been willing to admit either of two explanations for the same example, and that certain writers (as Blase in the case of *velis* of 25 and *valeas* of 31) have put under different explanations examples obviously similar.

We must then set up a new tenet of some kind. In reaching this, three factors are to be taken into the account.

1. The natural interpretation of the passage in each case. It is upon such interpretations that all grammatical categories must ultimately be based. In the present set of examples the natural interpretation is sure. If our minds were grammatically dispassionate, a judgment founded on the reasonable demands of meaning in such verbs as *sis* in 1, *habearis* in 2, *sis* in 3, *des* in 30, and many others, would see in these examples plain statements of a general fact. The only reasonable interpretations are: "a man is valued according to his possessions" (1, 2); "when you are dead, dead you are" (3); "when you ask for the truth, you give a man a chance to say anything he pleases" (30); etc. And

it is obviously an interpretation of this kind that Porphyrio had in mind in writing, in his comment upon *iubeas*, etc., of example 1, *relinque eum, inquit, qui miser est, quoniam deduci ab hac opinione non potest, quo minus putet tanti esse unumquemque, quantas divitias habet*. The direct form of the *opinio* would evidently be, *tanti est unusquisque, quantas divitias habet*.

2. If anywhere else we can find other modes of expression obviously conveying the same general class of ideas as any of our Subjunctives under examination, we should consider their suggestions.

Now it happens that many of our examples are *sententiae*. One of these *sententiae* is the very familiar one (appearing three times in our collection) upon the relation between a man's possessions and the estimation in which he is held. It can easily be matched.

Χρήματα, χρημάτων ἀνὴρ (scil. ἐστὶ), ὃς φῶ κτεάνων θ' ἄμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων; "Money, money (is) the man," he said, 'when robbed at once of goods and friends;' Pind. *Isthm.* 2. 11.

Οἱ γοῦν πατέρες τοῦτ' ἐπὶ πρῶτον τοῖς σφετέροις νίεσι παραινοῦσιν, ἐπειδὰν εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν τάχιστα ἀφίκωνται τοῦ ἤδη φρονεῖν, ὥς δοκοῦσι, σκοπεῖν ὅπόθεν πλούσιοι ἔσονται, ὥς, ἂν μὲν τι ἔχῃς, ἄξιός του εἴ, ἐὰν δὲ μή, οὐδενός· *Eryx*. Pseudoplat. 396 C.

Non quare et unde, quid habeas, tantum rogant.

Ubique tanti quisque quantum habuit fuit; Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 115. 14. from the lost *Danae* of Euripides (Nauck. T. G. F; p. 324).

Pauper ubique iacet; Ov. *Fast.* 1. 218.

Dat census honores; Ov. *Am.* III. 8. 55 and *Fast.* 1. 217.

Quisquis habet nummos, secura navigat aura; Petron. 137.

Quantum quisque sua nummorum servat in arca,

Tantum habet et fidei; Iuv. iii. 143.

Unde et illud proverbium: Quantum habebis, tantus eris; Augustin. *De disc. Christ.* 11. 12.

The second Greek example is an especially striking one, since, though the main sentence (a general one) is cast in the third person plural, the general second singular indefinite is retained in the dependent clause, and is in the Indicative. The phrase *illud proverbium* in the last example should also be noted.

It would seem, then, that the natural idea to come into the

mind in expressing the relation between a man's money and the estimation in which the world holds him is that of a general statement of fact.

Several of the examples refer to individual persons. Now among them are certain ones in which the ideas, down to the end of the introductory clause, look alike. Thus *at quom aspicias tristem* of 22 is substantially like *at faciem quom aspicias eorum* of 21. It would seem somewhat probable, then, that the concluding clauses would express similar ideas. These clauses are *frugi censeas* and *hau mali videntur*. They prove, as expected, to be alike in general force. It is probable, then, that the mood-force is the same, namely, that of a statement of fact.

These are the first factors in the determination of the nature of the idiom under discussion. The most natural interpretation to put upon these Subjunctives, whether in and by themselves, or in the light of the expression of the same general ideas by other means, is that they are statements of fact.

3. The third factor in the determination of the force of the mood lies in the study of the context of such of the examples as possess a closely attached one, of the same general bearing. This factor is of the same essential nature as the second, but is more decisive. It is, in fact, completely sufficient, by itself alone, to determine the answer to our question. It happens that in many cases the Subjunctive under examination is put into exact parallelism with a general statement of fact in the Indicative. Thus, in 8, *possis* is the amplification of *satis est* (not *sit*); in 5, *timeas* is balanced against *neque metus . . . est*, and, in 18, *prospera omnia cedunt* against *nequiquam deos implores*; in 24, *gaudeas* is set up as the antithesis of *iuvat*; in 23, *rideas*, *bibas*, and *decumbas* are hemmed in between the two general statements *ringitur* and *adponitur*, with the parallelism still more strongly brought out by the antithesis *ille . . . tu . . .*; in 19, *frustra iudicia implores* is justified by the general statement *fit*, and, in 20, the general statement *fit* by *invenias*; in 14, *matronae . . . nil cernere possis* is set over against *altera nil obstat*, and *videre est* is carried out by *metiri possis oculo*; in 9, *nulla potest oculorum acies . . . tueri* is clearly parallel to *nec*

cernere possis, and, in 13, *ut non . . . in omni agro reperire possis* to *sic non . . . in omni vita nascitur*; while in 17, not only is *hortere* balanced against a general statement *officit*, but the two together form the unfolding of the contents of the very significant Indicative *solet*, "it is regularly the case that." Note similarly *solet . . . desideres* in 26. In 28, *careas* is balanced against *caremus*. In 7, *abalienes* and *nihilne noceas (bis)* are parallel with *mediocriterne nocent*, *quantum est mali*, and *mediocre peccatum est*. And, finally, in 31, the correspondence between *valeas* and *habeberis* is so obvious that I am almost ashamed to have printed anything of the present paper except the title and this example.

The condition of things being what has been seen, there can be no reasonable doubt that the second person singular of the Latin Subjunctive may be employed to make independent statements of a general fact.

Such a conclusion should afford a sensible relief. The variety of explanations adduced above as having been actually applied to one and another of these examples, the heavily forced character of some of them, even for the individual cases to which they are applied, the contradictory explanations made by different writers for the same examples, the shift of ground on the part of one writer,—all show how hard beset grammarians and commentators have been.

In the collections employed, only examples that are surely to be classified as statements of fact are given. Once established, however, the category fits many other examples more naturally than does the category of Possibility, or that of Ideal Certainty.

The more important step has been taken. It remains to see whether the second is possible,—whether a probable origin can be found for the Subjunctive construction. I have long taught the following:

The extremely common use of the Subjunctive of the second singular indefinite in generalizing assumptions (relative or temporal clauses, or express conditions) might well, in time, affect the mood of the main sentence. To express the generalizing idea

in the dependent clause, the verb in any person or number except the second singular indefinite was in the Indicative, but if it occurred in *this* form, then the mood was, by fixed force of habit, the Subjunctive. The Subjunctive would then seem to be a natural mood to use *wherever* the generalizing force was intended, if the second singular indefinite were employed. Just as elsewhere, in the expression of this idea, Indicative went with Indicative, so here it would seem natural that Subjunctive should go with Subjunctive. If, saying *quod quis in manu tenet*, one goes on with *id desiderat*, then, saying *quod in manu teneas*, it would be natural to go on with *id desideres*.

This influence would be all the stronger from the fact that, whatever may have been the original force of the Subjunctive in these dependent clauses,¹ that force could no longer be clearly felt. The Subjunctive of the second singular indefinite had become merely the *sign of universality*. Why, then, should it remain confined to the subordinate clause?

This natural tendency toward extension would probably be furthered by the fact that the same second person singular indefinite happens to be in frequent use in a number of true independent Subjunctive idioms. Thus it is found in the Subjunctive Question of Perplexity, as in *quid agas?* "what is one to do?" Iuv. iv. 14; in the Question of Obligation, Propriety, or Reasonableness (to avail myself of a classification and name from own teaching),²

¹I believe the construction to have originated in a Volitive of the imagination, as in "lose your money, and all your friends desert you" (not, as seems everywhere assumed, in the Potential Subjunctive); and I have so classed it in the syntax of the Hale-Buck *Grammar*, §504. 2. But a treatment of this question would properly involve a discussion of the Greek generalizing Subjunctive (which I hold to be of parallel origin), and a discussion of my difference from Delbrück with regard to an important group of Greek constructions, for which this paper affords no room.

²The Subjunctive of Obligation, Propriety, or Reasonableness, first set up as a general category in my teaching at Cornell, is made one of the principal families of the mood in my general scheme, and several of the hitherto difficult types of dependent clauses seem to find full solution in it (Hale-Buck *Grammar*, §§512, 513; also *Classical Journal* I. 1. 1906, "An Experiment in the Teaching of First and Second Year Latin," where a conspectus is given of the uses of the Latin Subjunctive, classified according to origins). Not only is the mood-use a frequent one, but, in my opinion, it furnishes the missing link between the true Optative and the Optative (Latin Subjunctive) of Natural Likelihood, Possibility, or Ideal Certainty. (See my "Leading Mood-Forces in the Indo-European Parent Speech," *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XXXII. p. cxx [1901].)

as in *cur tamen corripias?* "Why should one chide her?" Iuv. x. 291; and in the form of statement which lies in the neutral territory of Natural Likelihood, Possibility, and Ideal Certainty, as in *crederes victos*, "one might well think them conquered," "one might think them conquered," "one would think them conquered," Liv. ii. 43. 9. The combination of these influences with the one already mentioned might well have led the Romans to feel that, whatever mood-feeling they had to convey, the Subjunctive was the natural mood to use, if the person was the second singular indefinite. But, most of all (after the primary cause), the natural tendency to extend the idiom would be strengthened by the very frequent occurrence of a construction which, though evidently of true Potential origin, clearly suggests and implies fact. Thus Juvenal's Potential in *Catilinam quocumque in populo videas, quocumque sub axe*, "one may see a Catiline in any nation, under any sky," xiv. 41, easily suggests "one sees . . ." That which is said to be anywhere and everywhere possible is easily understood as anywhere and everywhere taking place. The number of examples of this type (*videas, cernas*, etc.) is very large. An especially instructive set is afforded by *reperias*. I give three of these in sequence:

Quamvis malam rem quaeras, illic reperias; Plaut. *Trin.* 554.

Per pol quam paucos reperias meretricibus
Fidelis evenire amatores, Syra; Ter. *Hec.* 58.

Ut enim sunt, quem ad modum supra dixi, qui urbanis rebus bellicas anteponan, sic reperias multos, quibus periculosa et calida consilia quietis et cogitatis splendidiora et maiora videantur; Cic. *Off.* i. 24. 82.

In the first of these, "one may find it there," may suggest "one finds it there." In the second, "how few one can find," strongly suggests "how few one finds;" while in the third, *reperias quibus . . .* is put into formal parallelism with the general statement *sunt qui . . .*, "there are people who . . ." *Reperias* accordingly is completely ready, at any rate, to convey the idea of fact.

So much for the construction under examination. An independent use of the Subjunctive to express statements—assertions of fact—in the second person singular indefinite, exists; and it

probably is historically an extension from other constructions in which the Subjunctive had, originally, true-mood forces.¹

But did the construction become universal, where the idea of a general statement of fact was to be conveyed, and the second singular indefinite was to be used? It seems not. The older usage, which of course must have been that of the Indicative mood, still survived. In the future, the idea had necessarily to be expressed by the Indicative if expressed at all, since the independent Anticipatory Subjunctive had disappeared, wholly or almost wholly, from the language. But there are also examples of the present.

EXAMPLES OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE²

Nescis quid vesper serus vehat; Varro *Sat. Men. ap. Gell.* xiii. 11. 1; similarly, but without *serus*, in Macrobius i. 7. 12, and ii. 8. 2. (It would seem that *nescis* must be general, since in all three passages the sentence to which it belongs is given as the title of a book.)

Bis *peccas*, cum peccanti obsequium commodas; Publil. 52.

Cum das avaro praemium ut noceat *rogas*; Publil. 122. Similarly 658.³

Ita, si silenda feceris, factum ipsum (*scil.* culpatur), si laudanda non sileas, ipse *culparis*; Plin. *Ep.* i. 8. 15.

EXAMPLES OF THE FUTURE INDICATIVE

Quantumvis quare sit macer *invenies*; Catull. 89. 6.

Nulli facilius quam malo *invenies* parem; Publil. 395.⁴

Facile *invenies* qui bene faciant, cum qui fecerunt coles; Publil. 664.⁴

. . . divitiae et opes, quas facilius *invenies* qui vituperet quam qui fastidiat; Tac. *Dial.* 8.

¹Hence in my grammatical scheme, referred to above, this use is placed under the distinct heading of "Subjunctive Constructions Due to the Influence of Other Constructions."

²Examples are not given from the satiric poets, since they appear often to have been addressing, either through a long passage or for the moment, an imagined individual (cf. our "gentle reader"), and the exact discrimination of force is therefore uncertain for the Indicative mood. See, for instance, in 14 above, and cf. Lebreton *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*, pp. 349 ff.

³Publilius's Indicatives in the dependent second person singular indefinite are interesting, and will be treated, as well as Blase's view that there is no second person singular Subjunctive of Indefiniteness in dependent Clauses (*Studien u. Kritiken* II, pp. 5-8, 1905), in a later paper already indicated.

⁴In the light of the other examples given, Wölfflin's "emendation" to *invenias* is clearly unnecessary.

Ideo autem (apes) pungunt, quia ubicumque dulce est, ibi et acidum *invenies*; Petron. 56.

Assem habeas, assem valeas: habes, *habeberis*; Petron. 77.

Unde et illud proverbium: Quantum habebis, tantus *eris*; Augustin. *De disc. Christ.* 11. 12.

My collections for all these idioms are the result of chance happenings upon examples, not of methodical search over the whole ground. They make it fairly clear, however, that the Subjunctive is distinctly common, the Present Indicative, outside of Publilius and the satiric poets (see the last footnote but two), very rare. The statement in the Hale-Buck *Grammar* is accordingly not strong enough. For "sometimes," "regularly" should be substituted. It should be noted also that, of the various verbs employed in the Subjunctive idiom, *possis*, "one can," seems to be in largest use.

Finally, can any definition be made of the difference between the Subjunctive and Indicative idioms? The question may be answered as follows:

In the Subjunctive construction, the mood is a *sign* of generality. In the Indicative construction, the mood is *not* a sign of generality. One *feels* generality, if the context demands it; but it is not hinted at by the mood itself. The difference in the idioms is like the difference between English "you" and "one." "You" may turn out to be either individual or general. "One" is immediately and necessarily general. Compare the "Tacit causal *qui*-clause," Indicative, and the "Explicit causal *qui*-clause," Subjunctive (Hale, *Cum-constructions*, pp. 97, 112 f., or 107, 127 f. of the German translation).

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

A NEW FRAGMENT OF APOLLODORUS OF CARYSTUS

BY MINTON WARREN

While in Rome last spring I discovered five manuscripts containing the Commentary of Donatus to Terence, which have not been used by Wessner in his recent edition. One of these is in the Vatican library (Pal. Lat. 1629) and three in the Corsini library (43. E. 28, 43, G. 13 and 43, G. 23). The most important of them all is in the library of Prince Chigi and is numbered H. VII. 240. I designate it as K.¹ The order of the plays in the Commentary is *Andria*, *Adelphoe*, *Eunuchus*, *Hecyra*, and *Phormio*. This order was apparently followed in the principal codex of Donatus, the Parisinus 7920 (A) of the eleventh century, which unfortunately only contains the *Andria* and a small portion of the *Adelphoe*. This must also have been the order of the manuscript used by Priscian in his treatise *De metris Terentii* (cf. Keil III, p. 422), except, of course, that the *Heautontimorumenos* which follows the *Eunuchus* is not omitted. In many of its readings, both correct and incorrect, K coincides closely with A. In other respects, and where A is lacking, it agrees more nearly with V, especially in the preservation of Greek words and citations, which most of the manuscripts of Donatus omit.

Especially noteworthy in this respect is the comment on *Hecyra* 620, which Wessner prints as follows: *NOS IAM FABVLAE SVMVS ἀμavπά*, but *ἀμavπά* is the emendation of Schoell. B, the only manuscript which has kept any trace of the Greek, has *NANPA*. Here K has:

Nos iam f. s. ~~παρ~~ πὰν ἀρσομοδο
ρο μίθος ἐσμεν δὴ πᾶμφιλε γραντ γιρον.

The first word *παρ* has been crossed out. I give only the accents found in the text, but it is impossible to give the exact form of the letters. *γιρον* evidently stands for *γέρων*.

¹ A fuller treatment of K and of the other MSS will appear in Vol. XVII of *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.

The manuscripts of Terence give *postremo nos iam fabulae sumus, Pamphile, "senex atque anus;"* but recent editors almost without exception read *fabula*, following Guyet, who supports the change with this comment:

Libri manuscripti et editiones omnes habent *fabulae* cum *ae* sed *fabula* in singulari omnino rescribendum videtur, id est, O Pamphile, ego et Sostrata iam sumus *fabula senex atque anus*, id est eo iam per senectutem devenimus ut simus *fabula illa quae incipit, Senex atque anus*. Nota sunt fabularum argumenta ex Aesopo et aliis, *γέρων καὶ γραῦς, ὄρνις καὶ ἀλώπηξ*. τὸ *fabula* singulare, in plurale *fabulae* mutatum est propter pluralia illa *nos* et *sumus*, et praeterea propter duo singularia illa *senex atque anus*, quibus itidem necessario pluralem numerum interpolatores adiungi oportere arbitrati sunt.

The reading *fabula* is absolutely necessary if we accept the verse division of the Bembinus, which makes it a trochaic octonarius:

É medio aequom excédere est; postrémo nos iam fábula sumus.

Compare Meissner *Die Cantica des Terenz*, p. 575. Moreover it receives strong confirmation from the original Greek, which seems to have been, changing δὴ to ἤδη and γυρον to γέρων,

ὁ μῦθος ἔσμεν Πάμφιλ' ἤδη γραῦς γέρων.¹

To take up now the letters preceding ὁ μῦθος, I regard *απομοδορ* as the result of successive corruptions of Apollodorus written now with Greek, now with Latin letters. In the Commentary on *Phormio* 87 this is written in K *Appollodor'*. The abbreviation would account for the loss of *us* at the end. Compare *θηικ'* for *ἡθικῶς* in K *Hec.* 550, where B has ΗΘΙΚΝ, V *ἡθικῇ*. The two

¹Other possibilities are ὁ μῦθος ἔσμεν δὴ γέρων γραῦς Πάμφιλε, or making the verse trochaic as in Terence (*παντελῶς*) ὁ μῦθος ἔσμεν δὴ γέρων γραῦς Πάμφιλε, or (*παντελῶς*) ὁ μῦθος ἔσμεν Πάμφιλ' ἤδη γραῦς γέρων, where *παντελῶς* is simply inserted to fill out the metre.

For the asyndeton *γραῦς γέρων* I know of no exact parallel. One would certainly expect *καὶ* to correspond to *atque* in Terence. The order of Terence *senex atque anus*, as that of Apollodorus, is conditioned by the metre. I should hesitate to substitute a shorter name for Πάμφιλε to make room for *καὶ*, for Terence seems to have taken the name Pamphilus from Apollodorus as he did Syra. Compare Kock III, p. 283, frag. 8. In the verse as given above *ἤδη* = *iam*, but there is no equivalent for *postremo*. Possibly τὸ δὲ πέρας was used at the end of the previous line. It occurs at the end of a trimeter (Kock III, p. 292, l. 13) cited by Stobaeus from Apollodorus. Meineke, in his *Index comicae dictionis*, p. 829, translates τὸ πέρας by *postremo*, and Terence may have done the same.

p's might account for two letters *ρσ*, of which the *ρ* would stand for *p*, as in the curious corruption *et pipides* for *Εὐριπίδης* in both K and V *Hec.* 214, and in *And.* 406, where for *αἶροντες* A has *Alpontes*, B *AYpontes*, TC and also K . . . *pontes*. *μ* is a corruption of *λλ*, and the corruption may have been a very old one, just as in *And.* 57 for *mira ἔλλειψις* (probably written as often *ἔλλυψις*) we have in K *mire musis*, in TC *mire missis*, and in A *mire misis*, so that the corruption goes back to an archetype earlier than the eleventh century.

The letters given by Wessner for B (= Cod. Vat. Regin. 1496 s. xv) NANPA seem at first sight to be very unlike the first five letters in K *παρπα*(*ν*), but if we notice the following corruptions found in B: *And.* 447 TONNPENON for τὸ πρέπον, *And.* 350 ENI for ENI, *And.* 798 TPENON for πρέπον, *Eun.* Praefatio 1. 8 TPPOCONON for πρόσωπον, *Eun.* 14 IPANPOCARYAN for παρὰ προσδοκίαν, *Eun.* 405 IPOCHIONHSIS for ἀποσιώπησις; and if we notice that in A also we have *And.* 423 ANETÝXen, where B has correctly ATETÝXEN; in *And.* 696 NAPADOZWC, where B correctly ΠΑΡΑ ———; in *And.* 950 aNOTOY, where B correctly ATOTOY = ἀπὸ τοῦ, while C has *anotoi*, T *anota*, we must conclude that in the archetype of all these manuscripts the forms of Π and Ν were easily confused. Consequently, NANPA might easily be a corruption of *παρπα*(*ν*). As *παρ* is crossed out in K, the archetype may have had ^{παν}*παρ*, which led first to the writing of *παρ*, and then of the supposed correction *παν*. For the origin of this *παρ* or *παν*, however, as Greek I have no plausible suggestion. *παρ*' Ἀπολλοδόρῳ, which would be in place in a Greek scholion, does not agree with Donatus' usual method of citation. For the same reason *παν* cannot be accepted as a translation of *totum* (*Apollodori*); cf. *Hec.* 286. Moreover Donatus always places the name of an author whom he quotes before the quotation, not after one or more words. The Greek letters must then stand for Latin letters, and their explanation is not far to seek. We have seen that the Greek verse is translated by *nos iam fabula sumus Pamphile senex atque anus*. According to Wessner, *FABVLAE SVMVS* is written out in full in his MSS, but in K it is represented by *f. s.* At some stage in the trans-

mission the words after *fabulae* must have been indicated by *s. p. s. a. an'* or by *s. p. s. a. an.*; for often the first two letters of a word were written. Compare Wessner II. 229. 2, *LI. CO*, which the MSS have changed to *loco*; Wessner II. 230. 2, *ab. s.* changed in MSS to *abis*; Wessner I. 142. 21, *du. i*, in B for *dubium id.* Often, however, these initial letters, which had no meaning for the ignorant scribe, drop out, especially when the same letter is repeated, and thus *p. s. a. an* was reduced to *p. a. n.*, and then written *pan*, and finally *παν* before Apollodorus, written in Greek letters. This accounts for *παν* in K and for NAN in B (NANPA). PA may be due to transposition of the first two letters of *αρσομοδορ*. As we find Wessner I. 239. 3, *parato ole in* in A (*parato olein* K), but *πατατο ολεμ* in B, this representation of Latin letters by Greek in a late MS need not surprise us. So in V for *An ἀφαίρεσις* Wessner I. 405. 1, we find *ἀνάφερεσις*, while in C we have *anae. p. c. e. i. c.*, as if these were so many initials. Of this latter phenomenon there are innumerable instances. Sometimes it is only partial. Thus for the same word *παράλειψις* we find in C, Wessner II. 264. 21, *n. a. pA. AH. VY. IC*, and 273. 22 in B, *na pa HYIC*, in both cases *n* for *π* as in NANPA. Moreover, I believe the *σ* in *αρσομοδορ* is due to the fact that some scribe noticed that *s.* for *senex* after *P* for *Pamphile* had fallen out, and he inserted it carelessly after the wrong *P* (*ρ*).¹

I believe I have thus satisfactorily accounted for the corruptions existing in the passage. In conclusion, I must thank Wessner for the painstaking accuracy with which he has recorded minutiae in his critical apparatus, without which my proof, if proof it be, would have been impossible.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

¹ In the *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XXXIV, p. xliii, I have shown how by a similar error in Cicero *Brutus*, § 75, *bellum punicum* (i. e. correction to *poenicum*) was copied *bellum punicum*, then *punico eum*, and finally *bello punico eum*, the reading of our MSS.

SYLLABIFICATION IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS

BY WALTER DENNISON

Since the time when the "quantitative" method of pronouncing Latin was first adopted in America, much study has in this country been given to questions relating to the actual speech of the Romans. Thus such subjects as the correct reading of Latin poetry, the reconciliation of word accent and verse ictus, the mode of pronouncing elided syllables, and the admission of elision into prose, have commanded respectful, and even enthusiastic, attention. It is with a question relating to the pronunciation of Latin that the present paper also has to deal.

A rule of pronunciation, resulting from a misunderstanding of the Roman grammarians, a rule that has been perpetuated for eighteen centuries and finds expression still in nearly all of our grammars, is that in dividing the syllables of a word the Romans placed with a following vowel as many consonants as may stand at the beginning of a word in Latin (or in Greek); that, for example, the correct division in the following words was *fru-ctus*, *ma-gnus*, *o-mnis*, *i-pse*, *nu-ptus*, *lu-scus*, *pro-spera*, *maie-stas*, *no-stri*. Such groups of consonants are *bd*, *cm*, *cn*, *ct* (*nct*), *dn*, *gn*, *mn*, *pn*, *ps* (*mps*), *pt* (*mpt*), *sb*, *scl*, *sm*, *sp*, *st* (*nst*), *str*.

The statements of the grammarians on this point are accepted by Seelmann,¹ who introduces as supposed confirmative proof the evidence also of the Romance languages and of a few inscriptions. In 1896 Professor William Gardner Hale² showed that the doctrine of syllabification was based upon a misunderstanding of the grammarians, and that the evidence presented by Seelmann, especially the epigraphic evidence, was in reality damaging to the theory which Seelmann himself upheld. Professor Hale's position may be best defined by quoting his own language (pp. 251 f.):

My own conception is that the particular statements of the Roman grammarians on which the received doctrine is founded represented

¹ *Die Aussprache des Latein* (Heilbronn, 1885), pp. 132-48.

² *Harv. Stud.* VII (1896), pp. 249-71.

neither the facts of Greek pronunciation nor the facts of Roman pronunciation, but had their origin in a mere practical rule,—admirably simple and easy of application,—devised by some Greek grammarian for the division of words *in writing*, when one was near the end of the line and had room for a part of a word only; that this rule was adopted bodily by the Roman grammarians; that the Roman grammarians mostly, in discussing the matter, were not thinking of pronunciation at all, though if *asked* how they pronounced, would doubtless have answered: "As we write;" that, nevertheless, a few of them did think of it, probably drawing the false inference, natural enough to anyone except a trained phonetist, that, as writing and pronunciation conformed in most respects in Latin, so also they conformed in this.

In support of this position Professor Hale discusses the statements of Roman writers from Quintilian through Caper, Caesellius, Servius, and Priscian to Bede, and dwells upon the point that the use of such phrases as *in scribendo*, *in scriptura*, *si scribis*, which these grammarians employ when they touch upon the syllabic division of the disputed combinations *sp*, *st*, *pt*, etc., shows that they were thinking merely of *orthographic* division; in other words, that they were thinking of the division employed in writing the word down, not the division observed in actual pronunciation. Priscian and Bede, however, may, he thinks, have had phonetic division also in mind with more or less distinctness; the former, in stating (translating) the doctrine of Herodian for the treatment of a preposition in composition, uses the phrase *rationabilius esse sonoriusque* (II, p. 45 K);¹ while the latter, who is too late to be a witness, expressly says, *cum dicis sive scribis* (VII, p. 273 K; cf. p. 279). As additional proof of his thesis, Professor Hale adduces (1) the pronunciation of modern Italian, about which his observation is contrary to the verdict of the phonetists,² (2) fifty-seven instances of interpunctuation in inscriptions, e. g., in the word VIC·TO·RI, (3) the general impression produced by the examination of some five hundred inscriptions in which divisions of words between lines occur, and

¹ Professor Hale *op. cit.*, p. 268, points out that in his *Partitiones XII versuum Aeneidos* III, pp. 478 ff. K), Priscian, according to the manuscripts, violates his own rule in two cases out of the three involved (*om-nes*, *infrac-tos*, *si-gnum*), and thus probably betrays his own actual pronunciation.

² Skutsch *Krit. Jahresb. üb. d. Fortschr. d. roman. Philologie* IV. 1. 89, expresses his agreement with Hale's observation.

(4) the testimony of Latin poetry. At some later time he will present also evidence gathered from early manuscripts.

At Professor Hale's request, as mentioned in his paper, I furnished a part of the evidence from interpunctuation and the general results of my examination of the five hundred inscriptions involving word-division. The present article attempts to set forth the evidence of these two kinds, that is, the entire epigraphic evidence bearing on the question, in a practically complete form.¹ This evidence is mainly statistical, but a presentation of it will perhaps be tolerated, since it is apparently conclusive.

Two classes of inscriptions may be consulted for help. We have, in the first place, a small number which indicate the division of syllables by interpunctuation, as, e. g., *CIL.* VI. 26353:

D M
M · SER·TO·RI·VS
CRES·CES
AE·LIE · TY·CE·NI
CO·IV·GI · OP·TI·ME
FE·CIT

A separate study of this kind of evidence is made below (pp 64 ff.).

Secondly, there are some thousands of inscriptions which divide words between lines, as in *CIL.* VI. 22105:

D M
M · MARCIO · TERMI
NALI · IVLIA MODES
TA · FRATRI · DVLGIS
SIMO · BENE MERENTI·
FECIT

The principle of division followed by the Roman stonecutter could be revealed on an examination of a large number of such

¹The epigraphic evidence has never extensively occupied the attention of scholars. Schneider *Elementarbuch der lateinischen Sprache* 1, p. 763, in a long discussion of syllabification (pp. 763-91) summarily dismisses the inscriptions as offering only careless or accidental instances of word-division. Kühner *Ausführliche Grammatik* I, pp. 155-58, also devotes a long section to this subject, but his statement regarding usage in inscriptions is incorrect, namely, that word-division in them is "ganz willkürlich." Lindsay *Latin Language*, p. 125, Bennett *Appendix*, p. 31, and Sommer *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1902), pp. 312, 313, refer briefly to the epigraphic testimony cited by Seelmann. The real significance of the inscriptional evidence was first pointed out in the article of Hale referred to above.

inscriptions. But it is reasonable to suppose at the outset that the average Roman workman would make such line-divisions as seemed to him natural ones, not divisions which conformed with the technical rules laid down by the grammarians. In other words, these divisions would probably show the syllabification current in actual Roman speech, not the syllabification observed in formal writing. Now from literary sources it is perfectly clear that even in the time of Augustus words were not always spoken just as they were written, and that in some cases the grammarians taught a mode of writing that did not represent the true mode of speaking;¹ while there were also those who opposed this teaching, and believed that a Roman should write a word precisely as he spoke it.²

In dealing with this question it was necessary at first to determine whether any principle of division at all was observed in inscriptions, that is, to discover whether the divisions at the ends of lines were haphazard, or whether in the large majority of cases they followed some rule. At the outset, therefore, I tested inscriptions whose line-divisions involve the application of accepted rules of syllabification as, for example, the rule that a single consonant between two vowels is placed with the latter vowel, or the rule that doubled consonants are separated. If I find these accepted rules commonly observed, it would seem justifiable to conclude that whatever divisions occur in the disputed combinations indicate the current and correct syllabification.

The methods employed in collecting evidence and the extent of ground which this investigation covers may be briefly stated. I confined myself naturally to epigraphic evidence of Italian provenance. The volumes of the *Corpus*, upon which the following results are based, were therefore IV; V. 1. 2; VI. 1. 2. 3. 4, 4_{II}; IX; X. 1. 2; XI. 1. 2; XIV; including the parts of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* supplementary to these volumes. The

¹Cf. the writing, advocated by the grammarians, of *bs* (as in *urbs*) and *bt* (as in *obtineo*) which does not represent, of course, the real pronunciation.

²Suetonius *Aug.* 88: *Orthographiam, id est formulam rationemque scribendi a grammaticis institutam, non adeo custodit (Augustus) ac videtur eorum potius sequi opinionem, qui perinde scribendum ac loquamur existiment.* This remark follows the statement that in his own writing Augustus did not divide words at the ends of lines.

only use made of the first volume of the *Corpus* was to obtain data with reference to earlier inscriptions (see p. 63). The fourth volume was admitted because of the value that attaches to results obtained from cursive writing, in which the writer was perfectly free to divide a word as his own sense of correctness dictated. The *graffiti* published in *Bull. del Inst.* and *Notizie degli Scavi* since the appearance of *CIL*. IV were also examined. On the other hand, no attention was given to inscriptions appearing in the fifteenth volume of the *Corpus* or to those published in other volumes under the head of "Instrumentum domesticum," since inscriptions of this class are likely to have a monogrammatic character, the letters being disposed according to a given space or form. Several long inscriptions, of presumably Italian *provenance*, though appearing in other volumes than those already mentioned, were also tested, e. g., the *Aes Malacitanum* (*CIL*. II. 1964), the *diplomata militaria*, etc. The whole number of inscriptions examined was about 80,000.

Within the limits thus set the investigation included such inscriptions only as have been copied from the original (usually still extant) or from a squeeze or photograph, by an editor of the *Corpus* or by some other trusted epigraphist. It was obviously necessary to exclude all inscriptions whose arrangement by line is not absolutely known.¹ To have examined critically those known from manuscripts only, with a view to determining the line-division, would have been a task not only difficult and often fruitless in itself, but, since existing material is so plentiful, useless as well. So, in the case of fragmentary inscriptions that have been restored either by conjecture or from early copies, instances of division are counted only when the restoration is made at but one end of the word and is practically certain. Other cases which I found it necessary to omit are words that have been

¹ It is perhaps needless to call attention to such notes as the following frequently appended to inscriptions now lost: "Versuum divisio incerta," IX. 5407. 5922; VI. 502. 695; "Versus aliter divisit Don.," XI. 1615; "male divisit Maur.," X. 372. Differences of versification in two copyists may be seen in IX. 410 (and p. 659). Occasionally the lost originals of previously copied inscriptions turn up later and show wide differences in versification, e. g., *CIL*. V. 1050 (and note p. 1025), 4896 (and note p. 1081); VI. 1662 (and Add. p. 854); X. 304 (and note p. 962). Copies made in modern times can not always be trusted; cf. *CIL*. X. 441 (and note p. 964), 3607 (and note p. 974).

misspelled or engraved incorrectly, as *DVLCIS* | *MO*; enclitics, as *POSTERIS* | *QVE*, or divisions that are plainly etymological, as *PER* | *MISIT*, *CIL.* VI. 10241, *OP* | *TVLERIT*, XIV. 3014; and uncertain readings, as in *CIL.* IV. 396. In brief, then, the attempt is here made to discover how words are divided at the ends of lines in perfect, extant inscriptions where copies have been made or verified by expert epigraphists.

As stated above it was necessary first to observe how the acknowledged rules of syllabification were treated by the Roman stonecutter. The results of this observation, based upon an examination of all eligible inscriptions found in Italy, are presented in two tables. In the first table instances of correct division are arranged under the following heads: (1) Diphthongs and vowels, e. g., *i-ae*, *i-ei*; (2) single consonants, e. g., *o-no*, *i-mo*; (3) mute and liquid, e. g., *a-tra*, *e-brae*; (4) two

A. FOLLOWING ACKNOWLEDGED RULES

Kinds of Division	Perfect Cases	Restored by Conjecture or from Early Copies	Total
Diphthongs and vowels	184	13	197
Single consonants	7,153	1,166	8,319
Mute and liquid	270	25	295
Two consonants—same	1,019	108	1,127
Two consonants—different . .	1,816	299	2,115
Three consonants	53	9	62
Total	10,495	1,620	12,115

B. VIOLATING ACKNOWLEDGED RULES

Kinds of Division	Perfect Cases	Restored by Conjecture or from Early Copies	Total
Diphthongs and vowels	50	4	54
Single consonants	1,113	110	1,223
Mute and liquid	111	10	121
Two consonants—same	135	11	146
Two consonants—different . .	451	40	491
Three consonants	29	3	32
Total	1,889	178	2,067

consonants, the same, e. g., *s-s*, *m-m*; (5) two consonants, different, e. g., *m-p*, *n-c*; (6) three consonants, e. g., *n-tr*, *m-pl*. In the second table, similarly classified, are instances of division which violate the acknowledged rules.

We thus observe that in a large number of extant, well-authenticated inscriptions containing words divided at the ends of lines there are 12,115 instances where the division follows the accepted rules for syllabification, and 2,067 instances where it does not; in other words, more than 84 per cent. of the sum total of these instances divide correctly. The percentages by volumes of the *Corpus* are: IV, 84 per cent.; V, 80 per cent.; VI, 87 per cent.; IX, 82 per cent.; X, 87 per cent., XI, 83 per cent.; XIV, 83 per cent.

Since, therefore, syllable-division in inscriptions conforms on the whole with acknowledged rules, we shall be justified in accepting the epigraphic evidence, whatever it is, which relates to syllabification in the consonant groups in question.

The evidence follows. The cases in question are arranged alphabetically, first, those which divide according to the received theory (the theory upheld by Seelmann); secondly, the instances which divide the consonants of the disputed groups between the preceding and the following vowel. The illustrations of the grammarians will be found interesting for purposes of comparison.¹

CN²

PHILOTE | CHNVS, VI. 19365.

AC | NELLVS, X. 4519.

CT³

ADAV | CTVS, VI. 17221, IX. 152; ADLE | CTO, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 368; au | CTOR, X. 5670; CATAFRa | CTARIORVM, V. 6784; DO | CTOR, VI. 10183; EPI | CTE·TO, VI. 10681; EPI | CTESI, V. 4638; EPI | CTE·SIS, VI. 21278; EPI | CTETUS, VI. 11986; FA | CTAM, IX. 2827; FI | CTOSA, XIV. 2275; INDI | CTIONE, XI. 549; INVI | CTIS, V. 8032c; IREZE | CTESI, X. 2611; NO | CTIS, X. 7112; PERFE | CTOQVE, VI. 2078; PREFE | CTI, VI. 32006; STRV | CTO·RI, X. 1959; VI | CTORI, V. 5063; VI | CTORIA, X. 2482; VI | CTORIAE, X. 3076, XI. 2547; VI | CTORINAI, VI. 18703; BI | CTORINO, VI. 723.

¹ Illustrations of the grammarians involving a group of consonants not in this list are: *a-bdera*, *a-bdomen*, Priscian I, p. 42 H; *ab-ditur*, Servius in *Don.* IV. 427 K.

² Of the grammarians' illustrations, *Pyra-cmon*, *Al-emene*, *dra-chma*, Priscian I, p. 42 H; *Pyra-cmon*, *Menae-chmus*, id. II, p. 112 H.

³ Illustrations cited by the grammarians are *Eri-chthonius*, Priscian I, p. 13 H; *a-ctus*, *le-ctus*, id. I, p. 42 H; *aspe-ctum*, *affe-ctum*, *affli-ctum*, Bede VII, p. 263 K; *conspe-ctus*, id. VII, p. 268 K; *fru-ctum*, *fa-ctum*, *fi-ctum*, id. VII, p. 273 K.

ac | TVS, VI. 1527; ADIEC | TO, X. 5796; ADLEC | TO, XI. 5215; AIEC | TE, VI. 19027; ATHIC | TVS, VI. 28562; AVC | TORI, X. 1126; BENEDIC | TA, XI. 3566; BENEDIC | TO, VI. 10192; CORREC | TORI, VI. 1768; DOC | TOR, VI. 533; AEPIC | TESINI, VI. 4565; EPIC | TESIS, X. 2964; EPIC | TETI, XIV. 636; EPIC | TETO, VI. 18711a; EPIC | TETVS, VI. 17212, X. 4130, XIV. 683; EPIC | TE— | TVS, IX. 5547; EVTAC | TVS, VI. 17571; EXSTRVC | TVRVS, VI. 1585b; *Fac* | TIONIS, VI. 10076; *fac* | TO, VI. 2075; FAC | TVM, XI. 1146; FRVC | TVOSO, VI. 7788; FRVC | *tus*, VI. 5040; FRVC | TVS, VI. 16199, 28808; GALAC | TINE, VI. 25912; *Indic* | TIONE, V. 5423; *invic* | TO, V. 4320; INVIC | TO, VI. 755, IX. 5997, X. 6816, 6925, XI. 6631; INVIC | TIS, V. 8030; LEC | *toR*, XI. 1704; LVC | TVM, VI. 18086; OC | TAVI, V. 6644; OC | TO, X. 4515; OC | TOB, V. 6730, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 880; OC | TOBRES, IX. 5684; OC | TVB (*sic*), XI. 1408; PEC | TVM, XI. 3571; PRAEFEC | TO, XI. 3367; PROTEC | TO, VI. 11998; SENEC | TAE, VI. 18086; SOC | TES, VI. 18919; SPEC | TATO, X. 2383; TRAC | TVS, IX. 334; VEC | TIGALI, XI. 1147; VIC | TOR, VI. 31841; VIC | TOR, VI. 16326; VIC | TOR, IX. 1291; VIC | TORI, V. 8030, VI. 1167, 13266; VIC | TORI, VI. 18693; VIC | TORIA, VI. 7977, 36011, X. 3455; VIC | TORIAE, VI. 8084, 20635; VIC | TORINA, XI. 6553a; VIC | TORINAE, XI. 2328; BIC | TORINAE, X. 1503; VIC | TORINE, XI. 2775; VIC | TORINO, VI. 8875, XI. 2539; VIC | TORINVS, V. 5058, X. 3459;¹ VIC | *tori*NVS, XI. 6576; VIC | TORIS, X. 677.

CTR²

VIC | TRICI, VI. 531; VIC | TRICIS, XI. 5959.

NCT³

DEFVN | CTO, VI. 21342; FVN | CTI, V. 4055; *fun* | CTO, XI. 4214; FVN | CTus, VI. 33992; SAN | CTA, V. 1686; SAN | CTAE,¹ X. 2444, XIV. 6; SAN | cTE,¹ VI. 30738; SAN | *et*ISSIM,¹ XIV. 839; SAN | CTISSIMA,¹ X. 1909, XIV. 1509; SAN | CTISSIMAE,¹ VI. 7718, 16776, 20735, 22159, 28188, 29737, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 416; SAN | CTIS SIME,¹ VI. 35549; SAN | CTIS-SIMO,¹ VI. 13986, X. 5983; *san* | CTISSIMO,¹ VI. 18266; SAN | CTIS-SI-MO,¹ XIV. 440; *un* | CTIS, VI. 2075.

CVNC | TARVMQ., VI. 32051; FVNC | TA, XI. 2702; SANC | TAE, XI. 4967; SANC | TAES, VI. 19062a; SANC | TE, IX. 6150; SANC | TE, XI. 2702; SANC | TI, X. 4514; SANC | TISSI, IX. 3438; SANC | TISSIMAE, VI. 10761, 12537, 14289, 15641, 19173, 20327, 27945, XIV. 2202; SANC | TISSI MAE, VI. 26510; SANC | TISSIME, VI. 24101; SANC | TISSIMO, V. 3791, VI. 8954, IX. 888; SANC | TISSIMO, VI. 24436.

DN⁴

ARIA | DNE,⁵ VI. 28414.

¹ Cf. IN·VI·CITE, VI. 80, and note 4, p. 64.

² *Vi-ctrix* is the illustration given by Priscian I, p. 43 H.

³ The illustration, *defun-ctus*, is offered by Bede VII, p. 270 K.

⁴ Grammarians' illustrations are *Cy-dnus*, *Aria-dne*, Priscian I, p. 42 H; cf. *A-dmetus* and *Ae-bna*, *ibid.*

⁵ Cf. ARIADINE, VI. 21398.

GN¹

BENI | GNITATE, VI. 15860; CO | GNATO,² VI. 23849; CO | *gna*TVS, X. 5899; INDI | GNE, VI. 28523; INSI | GNIA, IX. 5684; MA | GNO, IV. 2174; MA | GNV, VI. 34635a; SI | *gnisque*, VI. 2086.

AG | NES, VI. 36476; ADSIG | NARETVR, XI. 1924; *ag* | NAM, VI. 2068; BENIG | NVS, V. 6464; BENIG | NISSIME, X. 4088; BENIG | NITATE, VI. 32420; COG | NATVS,³ VI. 2723; DESIG | NATVS, X. 6893; DIG | NATIONE, XI. 6335; DIG | NATVS, XIV. 2934; DIG | NISSIMAE, XI. 3368; DIG | NISSIME, V. 4850; DIG | *niss* IME, VI. 7142; DIG | NIT, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 101; DIG | *ni*TATTEM, V. 532; EG | NATIVS, VI. 18374; *eg* | NATIVS, IX. 853; MAG | NA, VI. 15029; MAG | NI, X. 6893; MAG | NO, V. 3221; MAg | NO, VI. 32808; MAG | NIFICO, IX. 2237; TESSIG | NIVS, V. 805; TIG | NVARIOR, XIV. 418.

MN³

ALV | *mnae*, VI. 11380; ALV | MNAE, VI. 12402, 23450, 25468; ALV | MNE, VI. 19219; ALV | MNI, VI. 26294; ALV | MNO,⁴ VI. 3367, 8679, 13139, 17198, 21095, 35501, X. 2248; ALV | MNVS, XI. 1854; DO | MNINA, X. 3452; DO | MNIONI, VI. 3572; HY | MNIDI, VI. 21561; HY | MNO, X. 3048; HY | MNVS, V. 5557, VI. 20334, 28041; LE | MNO, VI. 6702; O | MNIA, VI. 3495; o | MNIS, IV. Suppl. I. *CLV*; SCY | MNVS, VI. 19074; SE | MNE, VI. 15986; SO | MNO, IX. 1393.

ALVM | NAE, VI. 21903, 22729; ALVM | NE, XIV. 530; ALVM | *ne*, XIV. 1481; ALVM | NIS, VI. 28929; ALVM | NO, VI. 5499, 10903, 13457, 25085, 27629, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 284; COLVM | NIS, IX. 2475, X. 7946; *colum* | NIS, VI. 207; OM | NES, VI. 21787, 32420; OM | NI, VI. 11252, X. 7112; OM | NIBVS, V. 4937, VI. 13208, X. 476, 5654, 5657, XI. 1146, 4097; *om* | NIVM, IX. 5071; CEM | NA, VI. 27246; SOLLEM | NITAS, XI. 5265; SOM | NO, V. 6730, IX. 1082, 1386, X. 4497, 4519, 4546; *som* | NO, X. 3302.

PN⁵

DA | PNEN, IX. 2574; HY | PNVS, VI. 12375.

DAPH | NVS,⁶ VI. 8855; THRECEDIP | NVS, VI. 14306.

¹ The illustrations of the grammarians are *ma-gnus*, *di-gnus*, *a-gnus*, *si-gna*, *pu-gna*, Terentianus Maur. VI, p. 352 K; *ma-gno*, Dositheus VII, p. 385 K; *ma-gnus*, Albinus VII, p. 305 K; *prae-gnantem*, *pi-gnus*, *di-gnus*, *id.* VII, p. 307 K; *prae-gnantem*, *pi-gnus*, *pu-gna*, Bede VII, p. 286 K; cf. *My-gdonides*, Priscian I, p. 42 H; *a-gnen*, *id.* I, p. 42 H, II, p. 112 H. *a-gmine*, Dositheus VII, p. 385 K.

² Cf. note 4, p. 65.

³ Illustrations of the grammarians are *a-mnis*, Servius in Don. IV, p. 427 K, Priscian I, p. 41 H, Marius Victorinus VI, p. 29 K, Terentianus Maurus VI, p. 351 K, Dositheus VII, p. 387 K; *o-mnis*, Terentianus Maurus VI, p. 351 K; *sole-mne*, Albinus VII, p. 310 K ("secundum Priscianum"); *solle-mne*, *so-mnium*, Bede VII, p. 289 K; *calu-mnia*, *colu-mna*, Bede VII, p. 268 K.

⁴ But cf. ALVM | MNO, VI. 18222, 29066; ALVM | MNVS, XIV. 222; ALVM | MNE, VI. 36234; ALVMPNVS, V. 6722.

⁵ The grammarians cite *Thera-pne*, *Si-phnus*, Priscian I, p. 42 H.

⁶ Cf. DA | FINE, XIV. 2841, which suggests that there was a pause between *f* and *n*.

PS¹

COnLAB | SAs, X. 6922; CONLAP | SVM, X. 4858; IP | SIS, X. 1402; IP | *sum*, V. 532; LAP | SVM, VI. 1179; VIP· | SANIA, XIV. 1781.

MPS

COM | PSES, XI. 2288; *contem* | PSI, VI. 18659.

PT²

ADO | PTIONEM, VI. 2041; COE | PTVS, VI. 462; CONSCRI | PTIS, X. 3903; *corru* | PTAM, X. 8031; HYPO | PTO, VI. 26960; NE | PTVNO, X. 3412; o | PTIMVS, X. 1811; O | PTIONI, XI. 5646; PRAECE | PTORI, VI. 8979; SCRI | PTI, VI. 7582, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 210; SE | PTIMIVS, VI. 20853; THRE | PTO, VI. 2334, IX. 6164; THRE | PTVS, XIV. 668.

ACCEP | TORE, VI. 10050; ADOP | TATICIO, VI. 23673; CAP | TVS, VI. 10115; CORRVP | TA, X. 5348, 7996, 8009; CORRVP | TAM, X. 7997; *coRRVP* | TAM, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 739; CONRVP | TVM, VI. 22120; CORRVP | *tum*, XI. 6040; GRAP | TO, VI. 15405, X. 7630; NEP | TVNALI, VI. 12515; OP | TATI, VI. 3257; OP | TA·TO, X. 4079; OP | TATO, X. 4367; OP | TIMAE, X. 1500; OP | TIMI, V. 6122a, IX. 4999; OP | TIMIS, IX. 1478; OP | TIMO, X. 342, XI. 3367; OP | *tIMO*, X. 4553; OP | TIO, VI. 30760; OP | TIO NIS, V. 6609; PRECEP | TV, V. 6503a; RECEP | TA, VI. 26028; SEP | *teMBRIS*, X. 1193; SEP | TIMA, VI. 14513; *Sep* | TIMI, V. 5806; SEP | TIMI, X. 5052; SEP | TIMO, VI. 17744b; SVBSCRIP | TVM, VI. 2120; SVSCEP· | TO, XI. 3287; THREP | TIANI, XIV. 348; VOLVP | TATES, IX. 3473; VOLVP | *tATIBVS*, X. 1251.

MPT

ADEM | PTA, VI. 21285; EM | PTO, VI. 28706; POM | PTINA, VI. 2466; REDEM | PTA, VI. 13055; REDEM | PTAE, X. 3677.

CONSVMP | TAS, XI. 4781; CONSVMP | TVM, VI. 831; EMP | TVM, VI. 17158; EMP | TVS, VI. 17051; POMP | TINA, XIV. 532; PROMP | TO, XIV. 2934; SVMP | *tisque*, VI. 2071.

PTR³

accep | TRICes, VI. 32328; DECEP | TRIX, X. 2601.

SB⁴

LES | BI, VI. 17135; LEZ | BIAE, VI. 27031; Π PEC | BEYTON, VI. 31961; Π PEC | BITEPEC, IX. 6209, 6230.

SC⁵

ABA | SCANTO, VI. 25683; CRE | SCENI, VI. 22496; CRe | SCENS, IX. 5217; CRE | SCENTI, VI. 22055, 27872; CRE | S·CENTIANVS, VI.

¹ The grammarians cite *i-pse*, *nu-psi*, *scri-psi*, Priscian I, p. 43 H; *i-pse*, Priscian I, p. 461 H.

² The grammarians' illustrations are *a-ptus*, *di-phthongus*, Priscian I, p. 42 H; *nu-ptam*, *scri-ptum*, *id.* I, p. 43 H; *a-ptus*, *id.* I, p. 461 H; *ca-pto*, Caesellius *ap.* Cassiod. VII, p. 205 K; *Aegy* | *ptum*, Bede VII, p. 263 K; *pro-pter*, *id.* VII, p. 286 K.

³ *sce-ptum* is cited by Priscian I, p. 43 H.

⁴ *a-sbestus* and *A-sbustus* are cited by Priscian I, p. 42 H.

⁵ Illustrations cited by grammarians are *pa-scu*, *lu-scu*, Priscian I, p. 50 H; *ne-scio*, Terentius Scaurus VII, p. 12 K.

15719; CRE | SCENTINA, VI. 21095; CRE | SCES, XIV. 916; DI | *see*NTI-BVS, X. 7657; EV | SCHEMVS, VI. 19792; FI | *sco*, VI. 29917; GRAVI | SCANORVM, VI. 1408; PRI | SCIANO, VI. 25390; PRI | SCILLAE, VI. 25039; PRI | SCO, X. 2711; PRI | SCVS, VI. 25048, X. 380; *pri* | SCVS, XI. 4394; QVIE | SCANT, V. 5078; SV | SCEPTO, IX. 4192.

ABAS | CANTI, VI. 4080; ABAS | CANTO, VI. 16922; ABAS | CANTVS, VI. 6710, 10854, 17812, 18140, 18933; AΔEΛEC | XOC, VI. 14672; ADQVIES | CIT, V. 4063; ADVLES | CENTI, XI. 1147; ARES | CONTIS, VI. 13608; ARES | CVSA, VI. 13596; ARES | CVSA, VI. 21650, IX. 161, XIV. 1367; AS | CONIVS, V. 2856; BASILIS | CVS, VI. 36393; CRES | CENS, VI. 11294, 21347; CRES | CENS, X. 21; CRES | CENTI, X. 2658, 3660; CRES | CENTIA, X. 2163; CRES | CENTIAE, IX. 4894; CRES | CENTIANO, VI. 19914; CRES | CENTILLA, V. 2187; CRES | CENTINA, XIV. 1323; CRES | CENTINI, X. 7239; CRES | CENTINO, VI. 6693; CRES | CENTIO, V. 6075; CRES | CENTIS, VI. 21871, X. 2421, 2658, 3363, XIV. 3632; CRES | *cer*ET, V. 532; CRES | CES, *Bull. del Inst.* 1878, p. 89, XI. 2553; CRES | CETIANO, VI. 25837; DIOS | CORO, VI. 19939; DIS | *ciplina*, VI. 8619; DIS | CIS, V. 944; HPAC | KUWNAWN, V. 8733; FALIS | *corum*, XI. 3091; FIS | CI, XIV. 3643; FVS | CO, VI. 36289; GIS | CINNA, VI. 10910; LARIS | CVS, VI. 9494; MAS | CVLIS, V. 5002; MOS | CHIDI, VI. 23049; MOS | *chis*, VI. 34557; MOS | CHO, VI. 28414; PES | CENNIANVM, XI. 1147; PRIS |, X. 3570; PRIS | CAE, V. 4064; PRIS | CAE, IX. 5422, X. 8194; PRIS | CI, X. 3724; PRIS | *cia*NO, VI. 25036; PRIS | CIANO, X. 8404; PRIS | CIANVS, X. 1208; PRIS | CILLA, IX. 5100; PRIS | CILLA, XI. 3521; PRIS | CILLA (*sic*), VI. 22585; PRIS | CILLAE, VI. 20635, 34238; PRIS | CINVS, VI. 22841a; PRIS | CO, V. 8139, VI. 12079, X. 373, 4686; XI. 1147, 4533; PRIS | CVS, V. 2117; PRIS | CVS, VI. 22383, IX. 1506, X. 3452, XI. 2688; PRIS | CVS, VI. 24499; QVES | CET, X. 7550; QVES | QVAM, VI. 25667; QVIES | CIT, XI. 312; REQVIES | CET, V. 5710, 7531, X. 4519; REQVIES | CIT, IX. 1080, 1384, X. 4500, 7753, XI. 1412; REQVIES | CIT, IX. 1082; REQVIIS | CIT, IX. 1388; REQVIS | CET, V. 6251; ROS | CIAE, VI. 25486; SES | CVNCIAM, V. 4108; *tus* | CANICAS, VI. 2099; TVS | CIAE, VI. 1778.

SCL²

AS | CLEPIAS, VI. 6931.

SM³

CO | SMVM, IX. 2438.

COS | MIAE, VI. 11061; COS | MIANVS, VI. 13517; COS | MO, V. 8151; COS | MVS, VI. 411; KOC | MOY, VI. 33976; MYRIS | MI, VI. 7770; MYRIS | MVS, VI. 25827; THIIS | MVS, IV. 2160.

SP⁴

BW | CITOPANOC, VI. 5207.

¹Of. the suggestive spellings DISSCENTE, IV. 1278; ARESSCVSA, IX. 3446; PESSCENTI, IX. 4056.

²An illustration cited by Priscian I, p. 43 H, is *A-sclepiodotus*. But cf. the spelling ASSCLEPIODOTE, VI. 12504.

³*co-smus* is cited by Priscian I, p. 50 H.

⁴Grammarians' illustrations are *a-spice*, Servius in *Don.* IV, p. 427 K; *pro-spera*, Priscian I, p. 50 K; *pro-spere*, Bede VII, p. 286 K.

CRIS | *pina*, VI. 16593; CRIS | PINI, X. 1784; CRIS | PINIANO, V. 331; CRIS | PINIANVS, V. 8710; CRIS | PINILLA, VI. 14290; CRIS | PINO, IX. 1684; CRIS | PO, VI. 32694; CRIS | PVS, VI. 7276, X. 3431; HIS | PAN, IX. 1572; HOS | PITIVM, X. 7845; IS | PIRITO, X. 7551; POS | PHOR, VI. 27499; TELES | PHOR, VI. 12792; TELES | FORIANO, XIV. 1208; TELES | PHORIDI, VI. 12792; TELES | PHORVS,¹ VI. 290, 13246; TELES | *phorvs*, VI. 29385; TELES | FORVS, VI. 29605; TELIS | PHORVS, VI. 5768; VES | PER, VI. 9977.

ST²

AERA | STVS, VI. 7513; AVGV | STA, V. 3555; AV·GV | S·TA·LES, X. 2194; AVGV | STAS, VI. 33865; AVGV | STI, VI. 30894; AVGV | STINA, V. 3555; *Augu* | STO, VI. 32340; AVGV | STORVM, VI. 36308; BLA | STI, VI. 18416; BLA | STO, VI. 36322; CALLI | STVS, V. 8215; CE·LE | STI, VI. 80; CELE | STINO, X. 3550; CHRE | STE, V. 232, VI. 9477; *chre* | STE, VI. 33169; CHRE | STVS, V. 8356; *cu* | STODIA, VI. 1527; ETI | CTAMENH, VI. 30966; EVRHO | *stus*, VI. 23178; FAV | STHILLA, VI. 29623; FAV | STE, VI. 3012; FAV | STI, XIV. 1745; FAV | *stILLVS*, X. 7841; *fau* | STINA, IX. 3627; FAV | *sti*NAE, IX. 4292; FAV | STINAE, VI. 35807, X. 3106; FAV | STI | NVS, VI. 35067; FAV | STO, XI. 4333; FAV | STVS, VI. 2787b, XIV. 676; FAV | *stVS*, X. 5252; MNE | STERIS, VI. 18140; MODE | STE, IX. 3028; PO | STER, VI. 3372; PO | STERIS, VI. 14000; PO | STERISQ, VI. 24347; *po* | STERISQue, VI. 14401; PO | STERISQVE, VI. 25740; PO | *ste*RISQVE, VI. 35945; PO | STVMIVS, XIV. 3627; QVAE | *stori*, *Eph. Epig.* IV. 823; QVAE | STORIAS, VI. 2086; QVE | STORI, VI. 1803c; RV | STICI, V. 5557; *se* | STERTis, IV. Suppl. I, *CLV*; TE | STAMENTO, X. 3359; VE | STA, X. 3365; VILAGO | STI, V. 7837.

ABES | TO,³ VI. 19931; A | CHORIS | TVS, XI. 3393; AMETHYS | TVS, VI. 13986; ANTIS | TIAE, VI. 6688; ANTIS | *ti*ARV, VI. 7650; APOLAVs | TO, VI. 19841; APOS | TOLI, VI. 33895; AVFVS | TIO, VI. 34585; AVGVs | TALI, VI. 15876; AVGVs | TALIB, X. 451; AVGVs | TÁLES, XI. 3805, 6005; AVGVs | TALITATIS, X. 114; AVGVs | TALIVM, IX. 4067, X. 114; AVC·VS | TI, VI. 10931; AVGVs | TI (2), VI. 17924, XI. 6623; AVGVs | TIANVS, VI. 25038; AVGVs | TINI, VI. 13715; AVGVs | TIS, V. 8030; *AVGVs* | TO, VI. 1181; AVGVs | TORVM, VI. 29294, 36507, X. 1586; AVGVs | TVS, V. 1784, VI. 2605; BIAS | TVS, VI. 16995; BLAS | TVS, VI. 9571; CAELES | TES, IX. 4192; CALLIS | TO, VI. 20833; CALLIS | TO, VI. 20283; CAS | TA, VI. 6148, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 219, X. 4763; CAS | TISSIMAE, X. 3356; CAS | TITATIS, V. 4187; CAS | TOR, IX. 3219; CAS | TORE, XI. 53; CAS | TVLAE, XIV. 1488; CAS | TVS, *Eph. Epig.* IV. 933; CHRES |

¹ Note TELES | SPO·RO, VI. 18222.

² Grammarians' illustrations are *maie-stas*, Caper VII, p. 96 K; *maie-stas* Bede VII, p. 279 K; *pote-stas*, *no-ster*, Caesellius *ap. Cassiod.* VII, p. 205 K; *te-stis*, Priscian I, p. 50 H; *Ne-storis*, Terentianus Maurus VI, p. 352 K; *apo-stolus*, *Orthogr. Bour.*, p. 300 K, Suppl.; and cf. *a-stla*, **pe-stlum* (= *pestulum*), Caesellius *ap. Cassiod.* VII, p. 205 K, and *is-thmos*, Priscian I, p. 42 K.

³ Cf. such spellings as CHRESSTINA, VI. 13712, IVSSTI, V. 6127, IVSSTA, IX. 1268, and VESSTA, VI. 3097, which seem to show an effort to isolate the *s*.

TENI, VI. 24253; CHRES | TVS, VI. 11707, 32997; CLVS | TVMINA, XI. 4489; COMAS | tVS, VI. 3396; CONSIS | TIT, VI. 404; COS | TINO, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 788; CVS | TODIAE, VI. 10238; DIS | TINGVITVR, XI. 5265; EDIS | TE, VI. 18351; EPIS | TVLIS, VI. 8613; ES | TIVALIVM, X. 5348; ES | TO, XIV. 2112; EVARIS | TO, VI. 25287, 34403; EVARIS | TVS, XIV. 882; AEVARIS | TVS, XI. 4224; EVENVS | ti, VI. 24079; FAVS | TA, X. 8323; FAVS | TILLA, VI. 17051; FAVS | TINA, V. 3710; FAVS · | TINAE, VI. 24612; FAVS | TINO, IX. 1641, X. 4785; FAVS | TINVM, *Not. d. Sc.* 1880, p. 97; FAVS | TINVS, IX. 647; FAVS | TIO, X. 2919; FAVS | TO, VI. 5700, X. 8119; FAVS | TVM, VI. 2074; FAVS | TVS, VI. 11839, 23706; FAVS · | TVS, VI. 23560; FES | TA, V. 3730, 4994; FES | TAE, VI. 5345; FEs | TI, VI. 2696; FES | TIANVS, XI. 5785; FES | TO, VI. 14537; FES | TVS, V. 8247; HIS | TAR, VI. 5277; HIS | TONIESIVM, IX. 2860; HONES | TA, X. 7890; HONES | TISSIMAE, IX. 2603; HONES | TVS, IX. 2613; HOS | TIAS, IX. 5565; HOS | TILIA, VI. 18773; HOS | *TILIVS*, VI. 25551; IADES | TINI, X. 1402; IS | TERCORIA, V. 1706; IS | TIPEN, VI. 32694; IVS | TAE, V. 3968, IX. 1478, X. 3751, VI. 33417; IVS | TE, VI. 21332; IVS | TINA, VI. 22493, X. 4514; IVS | *tinAE*, IX. 1274; IVS | TINAE, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 114, XI. 1857; IVS | TINE, XI. 6023; IVS | TINI, V. 694; *ius* | TINO, X. 4512; IVS | TINVS, VI. 10221, IX. 1759; IVS | TITIA, IX. 1576; IVS | TITIAES, XI. 6204; IVS | TO, VI. 18121a; IVS | TO, VI. 20802, XI. 1891; IVS | TORVM, IX. 6400; IVS | TVS, V. 5020, VI. 24211, XI. 603, 1790, 6281, XIV. 634; MAGIS | TER, VI. 2078; MAGIS | TERIO, XI. 1947; MAIES | *tatiQ*, XI. 1429; MEDIAS | TINORVM, XIV. 1878; MEGIS | TE, VI. 34928; MERV_{is} | TIS, V. 5701; MINIS | tRATOR, VI. 33781; MNHC | ΘHCO-MENOV, X. 7176 (note); MODES | TA, VI. 17693, 22105; MODES | TAE, V. 2523; MODES | TO, VI. 13a; MODES | TVS, IX. 1895, VI. 33215; MODes | TVS, IX. 2223; ORES | TES, VI. 26432; OREs | TES, VI. 29800; OS | TENSE, XIV. 294; OS | TILIA, VI. 27977; OS | TITATIS, VI. 3454; PALES | TRICE, VI. 36393; PHILOS | TORGO, VI. 6788; TIC | TH, VI. 11933; POS | TAE · RISQVE, VI. 34574; POS | TERI | QVE, VI. 25306; POS | TERIS, VI. 10677, IX. 3922; POS · | TERIS, VI. 27977; POS | TERISQ, VI. 7899, 11071, 15197, 15710, 22057, 34267, 35567, 35672, 36338, X. 2191, XIV. 508; POS · | TERISQ, VI. 18818; POS | TERISQVAE, VI. 17213; POS | TERISQVE, VI. 6783, 7457, 8931, 10235, 10238, 10498, 10536, 10989, 11824, 12739, 13205, 13418, 14513, 15423, 16126, 17158, 18052, 18935, 20227, 20596, 21852, 22275, 22685, 23111, 24630, 26159, 26271, 26313, 26796, 30072, 33076, 34241, 34890, 36581, IX. 4329, X. 3594, XIV. 667, 735, 864; POS | TERIS | QVE, VI. 25793; *pos* | TERISQVE, VI. 16620, 19140, 22569, 35554, 36085, X. 7853, XIV. 1502; *pos* | tERISQVE, VI. 23208; POS | teRISQVE, VI. 29527; POS | *terisque*, VI. 30226a, 35577, 36195; POS | TERISQVE, VI. 12417; POS | *TERISQVE*, VI. 22682; POS | TVMianVS, VI. 32742; POS | TVMIO, VI. 24877; POS | TVMVS, VI. 2065, 2069; *pos* | TVMus, VI. 2074; POS | TVMus, VI. 2074; POTIIs | TATII, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 6; POTES | TATEM, VI. 1759; POTES | TATIS, X. 7996; PRAEPOS | TERAEE, VI. 22203; PRAES | TANTIAM, X. 3764; PRAES | TANTIOR, X. 2936a; PRAES | TANTISSIMAE, IX. 1578; PRAES | TANTISSIMO, IX. 1685, X. 1126, 5919; PRAES | TARE, X. 5336; PRAES | TETVR, XI. 2596; PRIS | TINAM, VI. 34561; QVAEs | TORI, V. 4341;

quaes | TORI, X. 406; REPOS | TO, XIV. 1688; RES | *tt*VERIT,¹ X. 4860; RES | TITVIT, X. 7494; RES | TITVIT, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 798; RIIS | TITVIT, IV. 806; RES | TITVTA, XI. 5217; RES | TITVTA, VI. 22205; RES | TITVTA, VI. 25559; RES | TITVTAE, VI. 26342; RES | TITVTAE, VI. 19886; RES | TITVTI, VI. 32873; RES | *tituti*, IX. 6333; RES | TITVTO, VI. 18200; RES | TITVTORI, XIV. 2917; RES | TITVTVS, VI. 23711, XIV. 1263; RES | TVTAE, V. 8856; RES | TVTO, VI. 2636; RES | TVTVS, VI. 18333; RVS | TICA (2), XI. 1147; RVS | TICO, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 795, XIV. 58; SALLVS | TIA, VI. 8454; SALLVS | TIAE, X. 6109; SALLVS | TIAE, XIV. 912; SINIS | TERIORI, VI. 26562; SVPER | TIS, V. 6464; SYNIS | TOR, VI. 17580; TES | TACIO, VI. 10242; TES | TAMENTI, VI. 33033; TES | TAMENTO, VI. 2437; TES | TAMENTO, X. 7518; TES | TIMONIVM, XI. 4097; TETRAS | TYLO, VI. 2080; TETRAS | *tylo*, VI. 2086; THES | TYLLIS, V. 7935; THAVMAS | TV . . . , IV. 383; VENVS | TA, VI. 28454; VENVS | TAE, X. 7964, XIV. 1266; VETVS | TASQVE, VI. 1793; VETVS | TATI, *Eph. Epig.* VIII. 798; VETVS | TATE, IX. 3162; XYS | TVS, VI. 10531.

NST

IN | STEIVS, VI. 15641.

CONS | TANTIAQVE, X. 4863; CONS | TANTINO, IX. 5955, X. 287, 6837, 6970; CONS | TANTIO, XI. 2697.

STR²

NICO | STRATO, VI. 10503; *no* | STRVM, VI. 1527; PALE | STRA, VI. 25473.

CAMPES | TRI, VI. 32706, IX. 3445; CAS | TRA, IX. 795, XI. 2606; CAS | TRENSE,³ VI. 8547; *cas* | TRENSI, VI. 29632; CAS | TRENSIS, VI. 4444; CAS | TRICIAE, VI. 16652; CAS | TRICIVS, X. 6338; CAS | TRIS, VI. 3293; CAS | TRORVM, V. 29, VI. 31172; EQVES | TRE, VI. 32328; EQVES | TREM, IX. 339; *eqVes* | TRIS, IX. 3158; EVPALES | TRO, XI. 1732; *filias* | TRO, VI. 19462; HIS | TRICILLA, X. 4036; INLVS | TRIA, X. 5651; INLVS | TRIS, VI. 32023; INLVS | TRE, XI. 4118; INDVS | TRIAQVE, VI. 1793; INDVS | TRIENSIVM, V. 7468; INDVS | TRIVM, X. 478; MAGIS | TRATIBVS, XI. 3943; MAGIS | TRATVS, XI. 1420; *magis* | TRVM(2), VI. 2068; MES | TRIVS, VI. 2812; MINIS | TRANTIBVS, VI. 2060; MINIS | TRATORVM, VI. 8924; NICOS | *trato*, VI. 34887a; NICOS | TRATVS, VI. 29248; NOS | TRAE, VI. 10458, IX. 3429, XI. 5265; NOS | *traM*, V. 532; NOS | TRAM, X. 477; NOS | *tRI*, V. 532; NOS | TRI, XI. 1354; NOS | TRO, V. 532; NOS | TRO, VI. 9150, XI. 6658; NOS | *tRO*, X. 6836; PROMAGIS | TRO, VI. 1422; PROS | TRAVIT, VI. 1716b, 1716c; SILVES | TRI, XI. 2650; SOS | TRATA, VI. 13684; VES | TRAM, VI. 1585b, VOS | TRVM, XI. 1823.

NSTR

DEMONS | TRATA, V. 5050.

¹Cf. RESS | TITVTORI, X. 4553.

²Grammarians' illustrations are *no-strum*, *ve-strum*, *Caper VII*, p. 96 K; *plo-strum*, *lu-strant*, *capi-strum*, *clau-strum*, *ra-strum*, *campe-stre*, *Oaesellius ap. Cassiod. VII*. 205 K; *plau-strum*, *capi-strum*, *clau-strum*, *ve-strum*, *ra-strum*, *Albinus VII*. 307 K.

³Such spellings as CASSTRESE, VI. 8523 apparently suggest the separation of *s* from the following consonants.

A. SUMMARY OF CASES IN QUESTION (BY CONSONANT GROUPS)

CONSONANT GROUPS	FOR RECEIVED THEORY PLACING CONSONANTS WITH THE FOLLOWING VOWEL			AGAINST RECEIVED THEORY DIVIDING CONSONANTS BETWEEN PRECEDING AND FOLLOWING VOWELS		
	Perfect Cases	Restored by Conjecture or from Early Copy	Total	Perfect Cases	Restored by Conjecture or from Early Copy	Total
<i>cn</i>	1	..	1	1	..	1
<i>ct</i>	25	1	26	64	10	74
(<i>ctr</i> ¹)	2	..	2
(<i>nct</i> ¹)	18	6	24	21	1	22
<i>dn</i>	1	..	1
<i>gn</i>	5	3	8	19	5	24
<i>mn</i>	25	2	27	30	5	35
<i>pn</i>	2	..	2	2	..	2
<i>ps</i>	5	1	6
(<i>mps</i> ¹)	1	1	2
<i>pt</i>	13	2	15	33	6	39
(<i>mpt</i> ¹)	5	..	5	6	1	7
(<i>ptr</i> ¹)	1	1	2
<i>sb</i>	5	..	5
<i>sc</i>	15	4	19	83	17	100
<i>scl</i> ¹	1	..	1
<i>sm</i>	1	..	1	8	..	8
<i>sp</i>	1	..	1	20	3	23
<i>st</i>	38	13	51	241	48	289
(<i>nst</i> ¹)	1	..	1	6	..	6
(<i>nstr</i> ²)	1	..	1
<i>str</i> ¹	2	1	3	41	10	51
Total	154	33	187	590	108	698

B. SUMMARY OF CASES IN QUESTION (BY VOLUMES OF THE *Corpus*)

VOLUMES OF THE CORPUS	FOR RECEIVED THEORY PLACING CONSONANTS WITH THE FOLLOWING VOWEL			AGAINST RECEIVED THEORY DIVIDING CONSONANTS BETWEEN PRECEDING AND FOLLOWING VOWELS		
	Perfect Cases	Restored by Conjecture or from Early Copy	Total	Perfect Cases	Restored by Conjecture or from Early Copy	Total
IV	1	2	3	5	..	5
V	15	..	15	50	13	63
VI	92	16	108	289	58	347
IX	11	3	14	49	12	61
X	23	6	29	98	17	115
XI	4	4	8	67	5	72
XIV	8	2	10	32	3	35
Total	154	33	187	590	108	698

¹In these groups of three consonants it is a question of dividing *c-tr*, *nc-t*, *mp-s*, *mp-t*, *p-tr*, *s-cl*, *ns-t*, *s-tr*, or of placing the three consonants with the following vowel.

²It is a question here of dividing *ns-tr* or *n-str*.

It is a justifiable statement, therefore, based upon the results of an elaborate count, that in the disputed groups of consonants Latin inscriptions nearly uniformly divide between the preceding and following vowels. Of 885 instances, representing a wide extent of territory, 698, or 79 per cent., divide in this way. The percentages by volumes of the *Corpus* are: IV, 63 per cent.; V, 81 per cent.; VI, 76 per cent.; IX, 81 per cent.; X, 80 per cent.; XI, 90 per cent.; XIV, 78 per cent. The percentages for consonant groups numerous represented are: *ct*, 74 per cent.; *gn*, 75 per cent.; *mn*, 56 per cent.; *pt*, 72 per cent.; *sc*, 84 per cent.; *st*, 85 per cent.; *str*, 95 per cent. Noticeable is the small percentage in the group *mn*. In divisions like *n-ct*, *m-ps*, *m-pt*, *n-st*, the syllabification may have been due to a perfectly natural desire to separate *n* and *c*, *m* and *p*, *n* and *s* quite as much as to place *ct*, *ps*, *pt*, *st* with the following vowel.¹ Subtracting these cases from the total number, we have 818 cases, of which 663, or over 81 per cent., are against the received theory. *sc*, *sp*, *st*, and *str* are the only groups which may begin a word in *Latin*. There are 537 cases of these, of which 463, or more than 86 per cent., divide contrary to the grammarians' rule. Of the groups *cn*, *ct*, *dn*, *gn*, *mn*, *pn*, *ps*, *pt*, *st*, *scl*, and *sm*, which may begin a word in *Greek*, there are 276 cases, of which 195, or 77 per cent., divide contrary to the grammarians' rule.²

Inscriptions of a public character, inscriptions of a relatively early date, and those which are made with evident care, show a marked tendency to avoid breaking words at the ends of lines. It is avoided by the use of ligatures or abbreviations, by superimposed and circumscribed letters,³ by spreading words, and by extending the line out into the frame or molding surrounding the inscription. When a division does occur in these three classes

¹ Such cases as *SANO* | *TI* and *EMP* | *TVS*, therefore, gain greater weight.

² The figures in Table A (p. 61) would be convincing even if we knew that there was no grammarians' rule, but they are especially significant since they represent the usage that existed in the face of a firmly established, traditional rule of syllabification.

³ This method was employed also by Augustus; Suetonius *Aug.* 87: *notavi et in chirographo eius [Augusti] illa praecipue: non dividit verba nec ab extrema parte versuum abundantis litteras in alterum transfert, sed ibidem statim subicit circumductique.*

of inscriptions, it is nearly always a correct one. On the other hand, private inscriptions of a late date, and carelessly made inscriptions of even an earlier period, show numerous line-divisions, and these often violate the regular rules of syllabification. Unfortunately, however, since there are relatively so few inscriptions that can be dated with even approximate exactness, it is impossible to make more than this general statement with reference to the comparative frequency and correctness of division in different periods. A study of data earlier than Julius Caesar shows that inscriptions antedating the last half of the first century B. C. rarely admit divisions of word by line.¹ No division occurs in the *Epistula consulum ad Teuranos de Bacchanalibus*, 186 B. C. (*CIL*. I. 196), the *Lex incerta rep. Bantiae*, 133-118 B. C. (*ibid.* 197), the *Sententia Minuciorum*, 117 B. C. (*ibid.* 199), the *Epistula praetoris ad Tiburtes*, early part of the first century B. C. (*ibid.* 201), the *Lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus*, 81 B. C. (*ibid.* 202), or the *Lex Antonia*, 71 B. C. (*ibid.* 204). The *Lex parieti faciendo Puteolana*, 105 B. C. (*ibid.* 577), has one (etymological) division, ANTE | PAGMENTO, and the *Lex Vicana Furfensis*, 58 B. C. (*ibid.* 603), shows TABVLA | MENTA and DEDICATVM | QVE. The *Lex Rubria*, ca. 49 B. C. (*ibid.* 205), shows twenty-six cases of division, eighteen of which are correct following the acknowledged rules, five are enclitic, one is etymological, and two involve disputed combinations, namely, FAC | TVM, II. 20, 21, and OM | NIBVS, II. 45, 46. The *Lex Iulia municipalis*, 45 B. C. (*ibid.* 206), has fifteen instances of division. Ten of these are correct according to rule, two are enclitic, two are etymological, and one is a case in question, PRAEFE | CTVRA, II. 89 f.

Occasionally a real desire is manifested to end a line with a complete word, as in *CIL*. XIV.² 696.

D · M
C · BLOSSIO · FAV
FAVSTO · FECE
RVNT · HREDES sic
PATRONO · B · M

Cf. note 3, p. 62, with reference to Augustus' usage in his own handwriting.

² A note in the *Corpus* says: "2 fin. FAV litterae erasae sunt, sed adhuc leguntur."

Similarly a wish to employ correct syllabification is apparent in *CIL. XIV. 1134*.¹

D M
L · IVLI · ALBINI
QUIETI · SEQ ·
L · ALBINIVS PVPVS
FIL · PATRI PIISSIM
MEMORIAE INSTIT ·
TVIT

The other method (mentioned above, p. 49) by which syllabification is indicated in inscriptions, and which betrays more clearly, perhaps, a conscious effort to divide words into their syllables, is that of interpunctuation.² Inscriptions of this class are not numerous, about 106 having been found in Italy.³ In some cases nearly every word in the inscription is divided into its syllables by interpuncts, as in *CIL. VI. 15546, IX, 4028*; but more often this mode of division is employed only in a few words, as in *XIV. 2202*, or in one word merely, as in *V. 5021*. In these inscriptions there are 504 instances of syllabification that involve the application of accepted rules of division; of these eleven only violate the rules. The cases in question are:

VI·CTORI, VI. 15221.

*DI·LEC·TVS, V. 6742; E·PIC·TE·SIS, VI. 16898; FAC·TIONIS, VI. 10074; FRVC·TI·ANO, X. 366; FRVC·TI·ANVS, X. 366; OC·TAVIA, VI. 23357; OC·TA·BI·A | NO, VI. 14560; VIC·TO·RI, VI. 28905; VIC·TORI·NVS, V. 5021; VIC·TORI·NVS, VI. 25928; VIC·TVS, VI. 33975.*⁴

¹ The *Corpus* explains: "6 fin. T erasa, sed legitur."

² An illustration of this class of inscriptions is given on p. 49.

³ They are *CIL. V. 783, 1117, 4868, *5021, *6742, *7542; VI. *77, 80, 440, 1070, 1089, 1344, 2428, 2459, 2553, 2557, 2570, 2591, 2669, 2706, 3581, *3689, *5692, 6700, *10074, 10238, 10724, *11682, *12269, *12288, *12524, *12866, *13668, *14560, 14949, *15221, *15546, *15719, *15799, *15917, *16567, *16569, *16898, *17114, 17305, *17308, 17812, 17929, *18034, *19574, *20137, *21617, *22627, *23357, *25928, *26146, *26345, *26353, *28093, *28427, *28905, *29737, 32460, *32475, 32746, 33206, *33975, *34246, *34714, *35572, *36284; IX. *394, *1520, 2892, *3437, 3721, *3997, *4028, *5546, 5906; X. *366, 633, *1344, *1585, *2002, *2166, *2194, *2349, *2723, *2758, *2966, 6354, *6382, *6729, *6792; XI. *3180, *3354, *3854, *3990, *5488; XIV, *34, *608, 1481, *1648, 2170, *2202. Starred numbers contain cases in question. The method of selection was the same as that set forth on p. 50. Such an example as *CIL. XIV. 1731* was therefore excluded.*

⁴ Cf. *IN·VI·CITE, VI. 80*, which seems to show a pause in pronunciation between C and T; and *VIC·CTORINVS*, which occurs twice in *XI. 5488*. Cases like *SANC·|TISSIMAE, VI. 26510*, where the interpunctuation corresponds with the line division, are entered in the lists constituting the main body of this article, pp. 53 ff.

SA | N·CTIS·SI·MAE, X. 2723.
 DEFVNC·Ta, VI. 36284; fVNC·TA, IX. 5546; SANC·TIS, V. 6742;
 SANC·TIS | SI·MAE, VI. 15917.¹
 SI·GNO, XIV. 34.
 COG·NA·TVS,² VI. 18034; EG·NA·TI·A, VI. 17114; MAG·NA·NIMVS,
 V. 6742; SIG·NVM, XI. 3854.
 A·LV·MNO, X. 2966.
 A | LVM·NIS, X. 6792; OM·NI, V. 6742; SEM·NE, VI. 26146.
 HE·DY·PNVS, VI. 77.
 IP·SE, VI. 15546.
 O·PTI | MAE, VI. 15799.
 OP·TA·TVS, XIV. 2202; OP·TI·ME, VI. 26353; OP·TI·MI, XI. 3990;
 OP·TI·MO, VI. 12288, IX. 1520; OP·TIMO, VI. 17308; RUP·TA, VI. 15546;
 THREP·TE, VI. 12524.
 RE·DEM·PTO, IX. 1520.
 CRES·CENS, VI. 12269; CRIIS·CIINS, X. 2349; CRES·CEN·TI, VI.
 16569; CRES·CENTI, VI. 16567; CRE | S·CENTIANVS, VI. 15719; CRES·
 CES, VI. 26353; NAS·CI, VI. 15546; PRIS·CIL· | LAE, XI. 3354; PRS·CVS
 (sic), VI. 11682.
 COS·MAE, VI. 26345.
 AC | ES·TIA, XIV. 2202; ADRAS·TVS, VI. 21617; A·MET | YS·TO,
 IX. 4028; AV·GV | S·TA·LES, X. 2194; AVGV·S·TALIS, VI. 13668; BLAS·
 T | E·NI, VI. 11682; CAE·LES·TI, VI. 77; CAL·LI S·TE, VI. 5692; CAS·
 TI·NI·O, VI. 14560; CAS·TI·NI·VS, VI. 14560; CEL | ES·TINO, XIV. 608;
 CVS·TODIAM, V. 7542; EGES·TAS, VI. 15546; E·VHEL·PI | S·TO, IX.
 394; FAVS·TE, VI. 12866; FA·VS·TI, X. 1344; HOS·TILIAE, VI. 19574;
 HOS·TILIO, IX. 3997; INIVS·TA, VI. 22627; INIVS·TAE, VI. 15546;
 IVS·TI·NA, IX. 4028; IVS·TVS, VI. 22627; fVS·TVS, VI. 34714; MODES·
 TAE, X. 3180; MO·DES·TE, X. 6382; MYS·TAE, VI. 32475; PANCRHES·
 TVS, X. 6729; PER·EGIS·TIS, VI. 15546; PIS·TE, VI. 15546; PIS·TES,
 VI. 15546; POS·TERIQVE, VI. 20137; POS·TE·RIS·QVE, VI. 15917, 29737;
 POS·TE·RIS | QVE, IX. 3437; POS·TER | QVE,³ VI. 34246; PO·TVIS·TIS,
 VI. 15546; RES·TV·TAE, VI. 28427; SES·TV·LEI·VS, IX. 4028; SES·TV·
 LE·IO, IX. 4028; STA·TV·IS·TIS, VI. 15546; VE·NVS·TA, XIV. 1648;
 BE·NVS·TI, X. 2166.⁴

The mode current in Italy of indicating syllables by interpunctuation is thus seen with perfect clearness. Of the eighty-nine examples here cited, eighty-two—all but seven—divide the consonants of the disputed groups between the preceding and the following vowels. The exceptions occur in the groups *ct* (one instance, *net* (one instance), *gn* (one instance), *mn* (one instance),

¹ Cf. SANO·T·O, VI. 3689.

² Cf. CON·G·NA·TVS, X. 2758; CONGNATO, X. 1220; CON | GNATVS, VI. 25828; and CONGNAT, X. 3408.

³ Cf. POST·TERIS·Q, VI. 35572.

⁴ Cf. ERAS·STO, X. 2002.

SUMMARY OF CASES OF DIVISION BY INTER-
PUNCTUATION

Consonant Groups	According to Grammarians' Rule	Contrary to Grammarians' Rule
<i>ct</i>	1	11
(<i>net</i>).....	1	4
<i>gn</i>	1	4
<i>mn</i>	1	3
<i>pn</i>	1	..
<i>ps</i>	1
<i>pt</i>	1	8
(<i>mpt</i>).....	1	..
<i>sc</i>	9
<i>sm</i>	1
<i>st</i>	41
Total.....	7	82

pn (one instance), *pt* (one instance), and *mpt* (one instance,, none of which may begin a word in *Latin*.

At times a preference for division by interpunctuation to division by line is manifested, for cases like the following repeatedly occur:

HERE | N · NIVS, V. 783; KAR · N | VN · TI · NO, D | VL · CIS · SI · MO, V. 1117; CO | N · IVGI, VI. 6700; AV · GV | S · TA · LES, X. 2194.

Of some interest and value are cases of syllable-division occurring within lines: these are caused by (1) some sculptural or sacrificial detail, e. g., VI. 5660, 7930, 22142; (2) symmetrical arrangement, e. g., VI. 5314; (3) a blemish on the surface of the stone, e. g., VI. 25009. Cases of the first class are the most numerous by far, but divisions made for the sake of symmetry, that is, intentional divisions, more often conform, as we should expect, to the acknowledged rules.

Additional proof, if it be needed, of the theory of pronunciation advocated in this paper is afforded by certain inscriptions not discovered in Italy but presumably of Italian origin. These include several public documents found in Spain, and the well-known *diplomata militaria*. In the *Lex Malacitani*, 81-84 A. D. (*CIL*. II. 1964) there are 123 line-divisions which are made

in accordance with acknowledged rules, and six divisions which violate them.¹ The following are cases in question:

FAC | TA, *LI*; REC | TE, *LXV*; COG | NITORES, *LXV*; OM | NIBVS, *LI*, OM | NES, *LXIV*; CIS | TAM, *LV*; POS | TEA, *LXIV*, QVAES | TORVMVE, *LX*.

In the *Lex Salpensana*, 81-84 A. D. (*CIL*. II. 1963), all ten cases of division involving acknowledged rules are correct. PRAEFEC | TO, *XXV*, and CO | GNITA, *XXIX*, are the only cases in question. The *Lex Ursoniensis*, 44 A. D. (*CIL*. II. 5439) contains 124 correct line divisions and two incorrect ones. The cases in question are:

FAC | TA, *LXXII*, RELIC | TVS, *XCIII*; STA | GNA, *LXXIX*; OM | NIA, *CXXIX*; IP | SE, *CXXXII*; REDEMP | TORIBVS, *LXIX*; ES | TO, *XCI*, TES | TIMONIO, *XCV*, TES | TIMONIVM, *XCV*.

The *S. C. de sumptis ludorum*, 176-180 A. D. (*CIL*. II. 6278) shows seventeen cases of correct versification, with the following:

SANC | TISSIMI, l. 17; PRAESCRIP | TVM, l. 46; SVMP | TV, l. 29; FIS | CVM, l. 13; QVAE | STVS, l. 7.

Of the 112 *diplomata militaria* known, eighty-seven were found outside of Italy. In dividing words at the ends of lines they follow the accepted rules of syllabification 433 times and violate them nine times. The cases in question are:

fun | CTI, *CIL*. III, p. 2000. FVNC | TIS, p. 853, *ip* | SIS, p. 870, IP | SIS, p. 877; SVBSCRI | *pta*, p. 851, SVBSCRI | PTA, p. 852, SVBSCRIP | *ta*, p. 2001; HIS | PANORVM, pp. 864, 1962, VES | PASIAN, p. 877; AS | TVRVVM, p. 852; AVGVS | TVS, pp. 857, 1965, HONES | TA, pp. 856, 867, 893, 1973, POS | TEA, pp. 855, 1962, 1975, POS | *tea*, p. 2001, POS | TERISQVE, pp. 868, 1963, *pos* | TERISQ, pp. 860, 879.

Of these twenty-five cases, three only place the consonant group with the following vowel.

The results of the foregoing discussion may be summed up briefly as follows: Latin inscriptions frequently divide a word (1) by interpunctuation within a line, or (2) by placing the first part of the word at the end of one line and the last part at the beginning of the following line. These divisions are not haphazard, or due to caprice or individual fancy, but they are made

¹ These are of such a uniform character that I quote them: QV | AE, QV | ISQVE, QV | OD (2), QV | EM, QV | OS.

in accordance with a nearly uniform rule. The results obtained from the study of a large number of such inscriptions should therefore be of value in determining the current mode of syllabic pronunciation. Now, the great majority of divisions involving the application of accepted rules of syllabification are made correctly. Consistently with this we should expect the true mode of syllabic pronunciation to be reflected also in divisions involving disputed groups of consonants, as *pt*, *sc*, *st*. An examination shows that in these cases the first letter of the group is generally placed with the preceding vowel or diphthong, the second with the following vowel or diphthong.

But, it may be said justly enough, we are attempting to determine the *spoken* division of syllables, whereas the inscriptions should illustrate, if anything, the orthographic division. It is perfectly clear, however, from the statistics presented in this paper that the prevailing epigraphic division is *not* the division taught by the Roman grammarians, and the language of the grammarians is such as to justify the assertion that they were thinking of an orthographic division. It is more likely, therefore, that the average stonecutter divided his lines, not according to the set rules laid down by the technicians, but by his subconscious feeling, that is, according to the practice actually observed in his everyday speech. The exceptional cases which we find in the inscriptions are probably due to the carelessness or ignorance of the engraver, or possibly at times to a real desire to follow the formal rule.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

THE SEPTIMONTIUM AND THE SEVEN HILLS

BY SAMUEL BALL PLATNER

In 1896 Wissowa published an article in *Satura Viadrina* (Breslau), entitled "Septimontium und Subura," in which he discussed the so-called Septimontium or second stage in the growth of the city of Rome, and gave a new explanation of the meaning and position of Subura at that early date. His views have been generally accepted by topographers, although of late dissenting voices have been heard. I have therefore thought it worth while to review briefly the history of the *septem montes* of Rome, and to present and discuss Wissowa's theory of the Septimontium and Subura.

In the literature of the Ciceronian and Augustan periods there are not infrequent references to the seven hills (*septem montes*) of the city of Rome, such as the following from Vergil (*Aen.* vi. 783): *septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces felix prole virum*, and (*Georg.* ii. 534): *scilicet et rerum factast pulcherrima Roma septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces*. Cicero (*Ad Att.* vi. 5. 2) speaks of the ἄστυ ἐπτάλοφον, and Tibullus (ii. 5. 55) writes: *carpite nunc tauri de septem montibus herbas, dum licet hic magnae iam locus urbis erit*. Varro (*De lingua Latina* v. 41) says: *Septimontium nominatum ab tot montibus quos postea urbs comprehendit*, and (*ibid.* vi. 24): *dies Septimontium nominatus ab his septem montibus in quis sita urbs est*. Aulus Gellius (xiii. 14), where he is quoting the opinions of M. Valerius Messala Corvinus, consul in 53 B. C., speaks of the *septem urbis montes* in such a way as to show that Messala used the term as an ordinary designation for Rome in his day. We may therefore assume without reservation that in the periods under review men spoke regularly of the *septem montes* of the city, and the question presents itself: Which were these seven hills?

A comparison of the notices found in the historians, Dionysius, Strabo, Livy, Varro, Tacitus, etc., makes it clear that these

septem montes were the hills of the city inclosed by the Servian wall, although there is nowhere an exact catalogue of all these hills in one passage. Tradition varied more or less in assigning the addition of some of the hills to this or that king, but its oldest form represented Servius as having incorporated the last two, the Esquiline and the Viminal. The chief variation in the traditional account concerned the Quirinal and the Caelian; but be this as it may, there is little doubt that under *septem montes* in the Ciceronian epoch were included normally the Palatine, Capitoline, Aventine, Caelian, Esquiline, Viminal, and Quirinal—five *montes* and two *colles*.

In later imperial times, however, with the growth of the city, it is evident that considerable confusion was introduced into this list, as is shown by Servius' note on the passage from Vergil (*Aen.* vi. 783) already quoted:

bene urbem Romam dicit septem inclusisse montes et medium tenuit. nam grandis est inde dubitatio. et alii dicunt breves septem colliculos a Romulo inclusos qui tamen aliis nominibus appellabantur, alii volunt hos ipsos qui nunc sunt a Romulo inclusos, id est Palatinum Quirinalem Aventinum Caelium Viminalem Aesquilinum et Ianicularem.

In this passage the list is that of the Servian hills, except that the Janiculum has been substituted for the Capitoline; a substitution easily explained by the fact that the Janiculum had become an important part of the city in Augustus' reorganization, and that the Transtiberine region could not be entirely omitted. Servius assumes that even in Vergil's time this must have been the ordinary view of the content of *septem montes*, for the expression *breves septem colliculos . . . qui tamen aliis nominibus appellabantur*, whatever this may mean, certainly does not refer to the seven hills of the Servian city as ordinarily understood.

So also the Bern. Scholiast on this same passage says: *septem id est septem montes Romae Aventinus Tarpeius Caelius Ianiculus Quirinalis Viminalis Esquilinus*. Tarpeius being only another common name for Capitoline, we have here the list of the hills in the Servian city, with the substitution of the Janiculum for the Palatine. A comparison of such notes shows that the later commentators felt bound to admit the Janiculum into the list, and therefore eliminated one or another of the original names.

In the Regionary Catalogue of the fourth century the list of hills includes the following: *Caelius Aventinus Tarpeius Palatinus Exquilinus Vaticanus et Ianiculensis*; and in the *Mirabilia* of the twelfth century we find *Ianiculus Aventinus qui et Quirinalis dicitur Tarpeius Palatinus Exquilinus Vaticanus et Ianiculensis*, showing an increasing uncertainty of tradition.

Occurring first in Varro we find another term, *Septimontium*, used in a double signification. In the *De lingua Latina* (v. 41) Varro writes: *ubi nunc est Roma Septimontium nominatum ab tot montibus quos postea urbs muris comprehendit, e quis*, etc. There can be no doubt that Varro means by this to state categorically that the settlement which has now become the city of Rome was once called Septimontium, because it extended over seven hills, the same which the Servian wall afterward inclosed. Mommsen has explained the passage to mean that there were as many hills in the Septimontium as in Rome, but not necessarily the same. This would involve the change of *quos* to *quot*, and even then it would be somewhat difficult to reconcile the text with the fact that Varro proceeds after *e quis* with a description of the seven Servian hills. Another reference to Septimontium in this sense is found in Festus (321), where we read: *Sacramini appellati sunt Reate orti qui ex Septimontio Ligures Siculosque exegerunt*.

The other meaning of the word is the festival celebrated on December 11, which occurs in the following passages:

Varro *L.L.* vi. 24: *dies Septimontium nominatus ab his septem montibus in quibus sita urbs est feriae non populi sed montanorum modo ut Paganalia qui sunt alicuius pagi*. Here it is perfectly clear that Varro believes that the festival of the Septimontium derived its name from the seven Servian hills, and that it was a festival which was celebrated by the *montani* in their local organization, as distinguished from the *populus* as a whole. Comparison of this passage with that previously cited from Varro makes it certain that there too the writer is thinking only of the Servian hills, and not of any different list.

This Septimontium was evidently one of the more important rural festivals in imperial times. Suetonius *Dom.* 4, says: *septimontiali sacro quidem senatui equitique panariis plebei sportellis*

cum obsonio distributis initium vescendi primus fecit. Columella (ii. 10. 8) speaks of the *Septimontialis satio*; and Palladius (xiii. 1) writes: *faba circa septimontium seri potest.* Tertullian (*De idol.* 10), in speaking of the temptations to idolatry to which teachers are exposed, says: *etiam strenuae captandae et septimontium et brumae et carae cognationis honoraria exigenda omnia.* Other references to the origin of the festival are: Schol. Veron. ad *Aen.* ii. 635: *septem montes unde etiam dies sacer septimontii constitutus est*, and Plut. *Qu. Rom.* 69: τὸ δὲ σεπτιμούντιον ἄγουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν ἑβδομον λόφον τῇ πόλει προσκατανεμηθῆναι καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐπτάλοφον γενέσθαι.

In the calendars the festival is mentioned three times. First in the rustic calendar, dating from the early Empire, found in Mantua and called *fasti Guidizzolenses* (*CIL.* I. 253). In this calendar only seven festivals in the six months from July to September are noted, one of which is the Septimontium on the third day before the Ides of December, the 11th. The other occurrences are in the calendar of Furius Dionysius Philocalus, 354 A. D., where it is written *Septimontia* and in that of Polemius Silvius, of 449 A. D., where it is erroneously ascribed to December 12. These late references show that the festival lasted until the end of the Empire.

In the other calendars which contain this date, the *fasti Maffei*, *Praenestini*, *Amiternini*, and *Antienses*, there is no mention of this festival, but only notice of an Agonium. This was explained by Mommsen as another designation for Septimontium, but the prevalent view at present is that Agonium is only a general term, denoting a celebration in honor of some deity whose name is not given, and that the Septimontium occurred along with this Agonium on December 11, just as the Liberalia took place on March 17, along with another Agonium (*Martiale*).

As we know that the festival was celebrated as early as Varro's time, some explanation of its omission from these calendars must be sought, and it is doubtless found in the fact that is noted expressly by Ateius Capito, cited in Festus (245), that all *sacra* were divided: *publica sacra quae publico sumptu pro populo fiunt quaeque pro montibus pagis curiis sacellis; at privata quae*

pro singulis hominibus familiis gentibus fiunt. In the calendars only the *feriae publicae* of the first kind are mentioned, and the Septimontium, being plainly a *sacrum pro montibus*, would not be mentioned in the ordinary *fasti* of the earlier Empire. This corresponds exactly with Varro's statement, already quoted, that the Septimontium was *feriae non populi sed montanorum modo ut Paganalia*, etc. Over the precise meaning of *montani* and *pagani* there has been much discussion, but the evidence justifies Wissowa in summing up the matter as follows:

... die in mehreren derselben Zeit angehörigen Zeugnissen erwähnten *montani* nicht anderes sind als die Angehörigen dieser sieben Berggemeinden. Abgesehen von der öfter erwähnten Varrostelle (vi. 24), wo die *montani* als Teil der Gesamtheit des *populus* gegenüber gestellt werden, geschieht ihrer stets Erwähnung zusammen mit den *pagani*, und zwar in der Weise dass man sieht wie beide zu einander in Verhältnisse der gegenseitigen Ausschliessung stehen, zusammengenommen aber eine höhere Einheit ergeben; ... d. h. *montani* et *pagani* bezeichnete an sich die gesamte hauptstädtische Bevölkerung, der Name beschränkte sich aber zu Ciceros Zeit in praxi auf die *plebs urbana*, ähnlich wie später der der XXXV tribus auf die *plebs frumentaria* (*loc. cit.* pp. 5, 6).

The conclusion would therefore be that the Septimontium was celebrated at the end of the Republic by the *montani* as such, although practically this embraced all the population of the city, about local centres, and that it did not become one of the *feriae publicae* of Capito's first class until the old and normal distinctions in such matters had been lost.

So far it is easy enough to follow the tradition, but there is another series of references which complicates the problem seriously. In Festus (348) we read as follows:

Septimontio ut ait Antistius Labeo hisce montibus *feriae*: Palatio cui sacrificium quod fit Palatuar dicitur; Veliae [*villae cod.*, but the emendation is certain] cui item sacrificium; Fagutali [*faguali cod.*, emendation again certain], Suburae, Cermalus, Oppio, Caelio monti, Cispio [*cis pto cod.*, where again the emendation seems certain and necessary] monti. This list contains the Palatium, Cermalus, and Velia, the three parts of the Palatine, the Fagutal, Oppius and Cispus, the three parts of the Esquiline, the Caelian, and the Subura. Paul. Diac. in his epitome (341) writes:

Septimontium appellabant diem festum quod in septem locis faciebant sacrificium: Palatio Velia Fagutali Subura Cermalus Caelio Oppio et Cispio.

There is also a mutilated gloss on the Festus passage which may be emended to read as follows:

(Septimontium dies ap)pellatur mense (Decembri III idus qui dicitur in) fastis Agonalia (quod ea die septem m)ontibus fiunt sa(crificia: Palatio Velia F)agutali Subura (Cermallo Caelio Oppio) Cispio.

Now, it is at once clear from these citations that Labeo interpreted the festival of the Septimontium as applying to a list of hills entirely different from those of the Servian city, and belonging to an earlier stage of the city's existence, when its extent was much narrower. In other words, Labeo and Varro are absolutely at variance with each other, and it is entirely impossible to reconcile their statements by any exegetical jugglery.

Further, there are eight hills named instead of seven, and it is self-evident that some error is lodged here; for no antiquarian would be so foolish as to cite the names of eight hills to explain Septimontium. Various measures have been resorted to in order to reduce the number to seven. Niebuhr struck out *Subura*; Bunsen, *Caelio*; Huschke changed the order and, inserting *in*, reads *Subura in Caelio*. None of these methods commends itself with any great force. It is evident that this list is arranged on no topographical or historical basis, and the only question arising is how to make seven out of an apparent eight.

Leaving this for the moment, and going back to the two explanations of Septimontium, we have to compare a note of Servius, already cited, on *Aen.* vi. 783:

alii dicunt breves septem colliculos a Romulo inclusos qui tamen aliis nominibus appellabantur; alii volunt hos ipsos qui nunc sunt a Romulo inclusos, id est Palatinum Quirinalem Aventinum Caelium Viminalem Esquilinum Ianicularem; alii vero volunt hos quidem fuisse aliis tamen nominibus appellatos.

There seems to be no doubt that *breves septem colliculi* refers to the hills that are given by Festus, and that the divergence in view between his source and Varro had continued until a late period, when antiquarians were divided between the two opinions and a third which was a combination of the two. All of which leads us surely to this conclusion, that in the Ciceronian period there was a festival called the Septimontium, celebrated presumably by the inhabitants of the city about local centres, but

whose origin was already so uncertain that learned antiquarians like Varro and Labeo published diametrically opposite explanations. This is the more surprising as it was a matter which concerned the topography of their own city. Such divergence of opinion on such a subject would certainly seem to be strong evidence for the remote antiquity of the Septimontium itself.

Now it has been generally assumed by recent topographers that we may distinguish two stages in the growth of the city between the earliest settlement on the Palatine and the city that was marked out by the so-called wall of Servius Tullius, and these two stages have been called the Septimontium and the City of the Four Regions. The evidence for the first of these is wholly derived from Labeo's explanation of the festival of the Septimontium, and from topographical possibilities and probabilities. The third stage is based on Varro's description of the four regions into which the city was divided—a division which is thought to antedate the Servian extension. As already stated, Wissowa's monograph contains the most careful presentation of this view, but it has recently been called in question on two grounds: that of too great artificiality, and that of too little basis of evidence. His argument in outline is this:

Varro was mistaken in assuming that the hills of his time were those of the Septimontium, and Labeo was right in believing that it was an earlier and different list; for it would be highly improbable, if not impossible, that the substitution should have been made in the other direction; and the discovery of an inscription of the Ciceronian period relating to the religious organization of the *montani* of the *mons Oppius* as a distinct body, with *magistri*, *flamines*, and a separate treasure, points to the continuance of earlier practice, when the Oppius was one of the *montes* of the city. This view is further strengthened by the occurrence in literature of *montani Palatini*, *montani Cermalenses*, and *montani Velienses*. *Montani* are distinguished from *pagani*, as pointed out above, and the Paganalia was the festival of the latter. We must therefore go back to a religious division of the city, when the dwellers on the hills were distinguished from the rest (*pagani*), and this period must antedate the development of the conception of the seven hills of republican Rome, as otherwise we should not find the terms *Velienses* and *Cermalenses* in use. As Paganalia corresponds to *pagi* and *pagani*, so something must presumably correspond to *montes*, *montani*; and the assumption that Septimontium does so correspond seems almost inevitable, especially when we remember Capito's analysis of *sacra* into *sacra pro montibus*, etc. After the new organization of the city by

Augustus the old distinction between *montani* and *pagani* naturally passed away, and the Septimontium became a festival for all the citizens, although this tended more and more to become a rural observance.

Further—and this is a most important step in the reasoning—if the Septimontium, or festival of the *montani*, was one of the *feriae publicae*, it must have originated at a time when there was no such distinction between *montani* and *populus* as a whole as Varro indicates, but when the *montani* were the only citizens with full civil and religious rights in the community; and the long series of years during which the religious organization of the *montani* remained closed against the rest of the inhabitants is evidence that the period in question can not have been unimportant and brief, but must have been long enough to mark a distinct stage in the city's history. Witness the occurrence of Septimontium as a name of a period, as well as of a festival. We are to remember also that the sacrifices were offered, not to other deities, but to the seven hills themselves.

Now, no matter what error there may be in Labeo's list of eight hills, it is perfectly clear that the Quirinal and Viminal were not included; in other words, that the Septimontium has to do with a condition of things antedating the extension of the city over that northeastern region, part of the territory comprised within the four regions of Servius, and which we have been wont to regard as marking a stage in the city's growth before the time of Servius. This forces us to assign the Septimontium to the first period after the inhabitants of the Palatine hill had extended their sway over some of the neighboring territory. If the Septimontium was the name of the city at any period of its existence, it must have been between the Palatine settlement and the City of the Four Regions. Supposing, then, that Varro is right in saying that Septimontium did denote a stage in the growth of the city, we must place it at this period, and admit that Varro was mistaken in his list, for reasons stated above.

To this argument of Wissowa's the objections may at once be made that two occurrences of Septimontium as the name of a period are not enough to warrant us in believing in the truth of the tradition; that, if there had been such a period, we should have certainly had other references to it; and, most important of all, that it is impossible to admit that so learned an antiquarian as Varro should have been in doubt about such a matter. This last is a serious objection, and therefore, leaving it for the present, it will be well to examine the questions connected with the names of the *montes* themselves.

Three passages need to be taken into account, those already quoted (p. 73) from Festus and Paulus, and a third from Lydus, whose reputation for obscurity is here ably sustained. *De mens.* 118 Bekker:

ἐν ταύτῃ καὶ ἡ λεγομένη παρ' [αὐτῶν Σεπτι]μόντιος ἱορτὴ ἐπετελεῖτο, τοὔτεστιν ἡ περίοδος τῆς πόλ[εως, ὅτι ἐπὶ ζ' λ]όφους τὰ τεῖχη τῆς Ῥώμης

ἐκτίεται. ὀνόμα[τα δὲ] τοῦτ[ων· Πα]λάτιον Σκύλιον Ταρπήιον Ἀβεντίνον
 Τιβο[ύρτιον Πρα]ν[έσ]τιον Βιμινάλιον. [παρὰ] δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἑτέρως οὕτως·
 Ἀβεν[τ]ίνος Κέλιος [Ἑσκ]ύλιος Καπιτολίος Βελινήσιος Κυ[ρινά]λιος Παλα-
 [τίνος].

The uncertainties and possibilities of the text of Lydus are numerous, but it appears probable that he is attempting to reproduce the view contained in the passage from Servius previously cited, and that in his first list he intends to give the names of the seven hills of the republican city, Τιβο[ύρτιον] standing for Caelian and Πρα]ν[έσ]τιον for Quirinal, although this is very problematical. In the second list he has, as a matter of fact, given the Servian hills over again, except that Βελινήσιος (Velia) has displaced the Viminal. His evidence may be regarded, therefore, as valueless for the actual lists, but as valuable for its bearing on three points: (1) that he, too, recognized Septimontium as a name of one stage in the city's growth (ἡ περίοδος τῆς πόλ[εως] ὅτι ἐπὶ ε' λ]όφους τὰ τεῖχη τῆς Ῥώμης ἐκτίεται); (2) that there had been almost always two interpretations of the application of the term Septimontium; and (3) that any definiteness of distinction in the names of the two sets of hills had long since died out. We are left, therefore, to the testimony of Labeo alone for the names of the earlier list.

There are in this list three difficulties—one purely formal, namely the presence of eight instead of seven names, and two questions of topographical fact, namely the explanation of Subura and Fagutal. It is now generally admitted that Fagutal was the name applied to the slope of the Oppius toward the Velia, the present situation of the well-known church of S. Pietro in Vincoli. In earlier times it was sometimes regarded as the valley between the Oppius and the Cispius, but that was when the valley of the Subura was also thought to have had a place among the *montes*. This identification of the Fagutal may be regarded as an accepted fact, and Labeo's list contains, therefore, the three parts of the Palatine—Palatium, Cermalus, and Velia—which are thoroughly vouched for by manifold evidence, the three parts of the Esquiline—Oppius, Cispius, and Fagutal—and the Caelius and the Subura.

The Subura in historical times was one of the best-known

districts of Rome, not altogether to its credit. It was the valley stretching from the Forum up between the Oppius and the Cispius, and can not by any subterfuge have been called a *mons*. Another suggested explanation is that Subura was first part of one of the hills, and then became the designation of the valley at its foot; but this would be an unexampled and unnatural transfer.

Not to linger over less probable hypotheses, Wissowa argues as follows:

Niebuhr's method of simply striking out Subura is wrong, for the mention of Caelius is irregular; that is, in the Festus citation it is inserted between Oppio and Cispio, thus breaking the order *Oppio monti Cispio monti*, in which it seems to be quite clear that after the five substantive forms the two adjectives *Oppius* and *Cispius* are used with *mons*, while in the epitome Caelius is the only word that has changed its place. Caelius is also the only name that has the same form in the early list and in that of the hills of Servius, for Palatium becomes *mons Palatinus*, so that the suggestion of the interpolation of Caelius lies near at hand.

On the other hand, there seems to be no possible reason for the interpolation of Subura, and even if Subura is dropped from the Septimontium, the *regio Suburana* of the next stage of Rome's growth remains still an unsolved mystery, if it is supposed to refer to the historical Subura, inasmuch as we have ample evidence that it (the *regio*) lay principally on the Caelian! Everyone will remember the very peculiar shape that earlier maps gave to the *regio Suburana* in order to make it include all that seemed to belong to it. Careful examination shows with sufficient clearness that this *regio* must have included only the Caelian district, and there seems to be no other explanation possible except to admit that the topographical unit, from which the *regio* was named, lay on the Caelian, and was quite different from the Subura of later times. This unit must have been a hill, to correspond with the usage in other cases, and therefore one of the parts of the Caelian, as the adjacent hills are excluded by the limits of the other three regions, as Varro enumerates them. The conclusion, therefore, is that the mention of the Caelian in the series of the seven hills of the Septimontium is incorrect, but that it is by no means a mere interpolation; for no one who had intentionally inserted an eighth hill would have omitted to drop one of the other names that had become almost obsolete, so that the number might correspond. Caelius belongs in Labeo's text, but as an explanation of Subura, which Labeo knew was not the Subura of his time, but a part of the Caelian. This theory gives us four natural and symmetrical regions, and leaves the valley of the later Subura outside of the city until the union of the earlier Roman settlement with that on the Quirinal and Viminal—a topographical necessity.

While it is not certain to which part of the Caelian we should attach the name Subura, whether to the western part (with Richter) or to the eastern part (with Wissowa), so far as his explanation of Caelio-Subura goes the latter's argument seems probable,

well supported by evidence, and altogether acceptable, *provided* we may believe that there was a difference between the name Subura in historical times and earlier. He says:

Aside from Labeo, there is no evidence to be got from literature, nor has any etymology of the word been found. Varro and Verrius derive the name *Suburana tribus* or *regio* from a *pagus Succusanus*, and we know that the official abbreviation of this word was *Suc*. Plainly, therefore, the original form was *Sucusa* or *Succusa*, the name of the part of the *Caelius*. The ancients regarded these two names as identical, but this does not prove that they were so by any means, especially as, etymologically, *Subura* can not have been derived from *Sucusa*, and the way out is to assume that they were originally separate things, and that the names became confounded in later times when the earlier names of parts of hills gradually dropped out of use. Verrius says that the *pagus Succusanus* derived its name "a stativo praesidio quod solitum sit succurrere Esquilis infestantibus eam partem urbis Gabinis," and, so far as this goes, it is additional evidence for a district on the Caelian, rather than in the valley of the later *Subura*—a most irrational place for a garrison to be stationed to defend the city from the attacks of the Gabinians.

On the whole, this theory seems to me the only one that can lay any claim to probability, or to being a reasonably satisfactory explanation of the situation. The principal difficulties—and the only ones that are of special importance—are, first, the discrepancy between Varro and Labeo, and the apparent ignorance on the part of the former of the original content of *Septimontium* as given by the latter. If Varro was not ignorant of this, he must have deliberately refused to admit its truth, in which case we should, I suppose, be bound to accept his view as against that of Labeo in a matter of Roman antiquities. To be taken in connection with this objection, however, is the increasing confusion in regard to the whole matter of the names and number of the hills, so that a difference in the first century B. C. does not seem quite so strange as it otherwise might. Anyone who had accepted the canonical account of the founding of Rome, as it had taken shape in the time of Cicero, would probably find it hard to divert his thoughts from the history of the addition of the seven Servian hills, as we find it given in Livy. The silence of other Roman writers about the *Septimontium* does not seem a valid objection in the face of reasonable evidence, no matter how confined in compass. I see no other way, therefore, than to admit that Varro was mistaken in this instance—or else to throw out the whole theory.

The second objection is that of the confusion in the meaning of Subura, and the transfer of the name in historical times to the valley. This difficulty can be explained, apparently, in no other way than that which Wissowa has worked out; and here again, if one rejects the possibility of this explanation, he must perforce reject the whole theory.

Personally, I think that the weight of present evidence is strongly in favor of this view, and that it is the only working hypothesis as yet advanced which enables us to correlate the known facts of early Roman topography. This it does so well that there is not sufficient ground for refusing to accept it.

The history of the "Seven Hills" is therefore this: After the city had extended its limits beyond the Palatine, it included seven hills, or separate points of hills, the three of the Palatine, Palatium, Cermalus, and Velia, the three of the Esquiline, Oppius, Cispius and Fagutal, and the eastern or western point of the Caelius, Succusa (Subura). A festival, the Septimontium, was established in honor of the existing city, celebrated by the *montani* separately. The same name was given to the city itself, probably before the institution of the festival.

After the Servian wall was built, in historical times, the old Septimontium was explained as referring to the seven hills now inclosed within this wall, viz.: Palatine, Capitoline, Aventine, Caelian, Esquiline, Viminal, and Quirinal. This became the canonical content of the term, recognized by the people in general and even by historians, the only exceptions being a few antiquarians like Labeo; although it seems that a dim idea was floating about that originally some other hills had been meant. But the *septem montes* of Latin literature were those just enumerated.

After Augustus had reorganized Rome and divided it into fourteen regions, of which the Transtiberine district formed one, and a very important one, it seemed manifestly improper to omit the Janiculum from the list of the seven hills, and therefore, as time went on, we find this hill substituted for one of the Servian, as, e. g., for the Capitoline in the note of Servius. In the earlier Middle Ages the Vaticanus also appears.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A CASE OF IOTACISM IN THEMISTIUS

In Themistius on Aristotle's *Physics* vi. 9 (p. 200. 8 Schenkl, p. 393. 25 Spengel) the editions read:

κάνταῦθα δὴ τὴν ἐπ' ἀπειρον διαίρεσιν αἰτιατέον ὡς ἐνεργεῖα ποιεῖται ὁ λόγος αὐτὴν οὐ
δυνάμει. τοσοῦτον γὰρ οὗτος τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ διαφέρει τῷ μὴ ποιεῖν εἰς ἡμίση τὴν διαίρεσιν
ἐπ' ἀπειρον, ἀλλ' ἴσον δὴποτε λόγον.

The last four words do not yield the sense required. Themistius means that the bisection *ad infinitum* of Zeno differs from the Achilles and the tortoise fallacy, in that the latter divides successively, not in halves, but *into whatsoever ratio*. We must plainly replace ἴσον δὴποτε λόγον by εἰς ὃν δὴποτε λόγον. For the idiomatic use of δὴποτε cf. Herod. vi. 134: ὃ τι δὴ ποτε πρήξοντα; Epicurus *Sentent.* 36: κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἴδιον χάρας καὶ ὅσων δὴ ποτε αἰτιῶν; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1144 a. 33: καὶ τὸ ἀριστον ὅτι δὴποτε ὄν;

PAUL SHOREY.

TACITUS *DIALOGUS* 20. 10

Praecurrat hoc tempore iudex dicentem, et nisi aut cursu argumentorum aut colore sententiarum aut nitore et cultu discriptionum invitatus et corruptus est, aversatur.

In the spirited defense of the power and significance of the new oratory which Aper presents, the suggestion of the *corrupting* influence of great eloquence is an inappropriate touch, only suitable to an opponent of the claims of oratory; cf. a fragment of Cic. *De re publ.* in Am. Mar. 30. 4. 10. For the general course of Aper's confident argument the appropriate word is obtained by the change of a single letter, viz., CORREPTUS. The judge is allured by the charm and sweep of the orator's language, and is finally carried away—*invitatus et correptus*. The juxtaposition of these two ideas in descriptions of oratorical power is frequent. Cic. *De or.* ii. 176: *si adsequetur . . . ut eos quocumque velit vel trahere vel rapere possit*, etc. *De or.* i. 30: *dicendo . . . hominum mentes adlicere, voluntates impellere quo velit*. Quint. x. 1. 110: (*iudex*) *non rapi videatur, sed sequi*. Anon. *De rhet.* Spg. P. 210. 28: (ἡ ὑπόκρισις) . . . δელιάζει καὶ καθέλκει τὴν γνώμην τοῦ κριτοῦ. Cf. *De or.* ii. 187; Quint. vi. 2. 3; viii. 3. 4; ix. 4. 12; xii. 10. 61. For *corripere* in this usage see Quint. ix. 2. 104: *Celsus excitare iudicem . . . satisfacere, precari, corripere, figuras putat*. Augustine *C. Cresc. Donat.* i. 10 (Migne IX, p. 453): *ibi (in ecclesia) forsitan putas*

corripiendos et convincendos esse diversa sentientes—where *corripiendos* and *convincendos* refer respectively to the functions of rhetoric and dialectic, with the use of which Cresconius has charged Augustine.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

SCHLICHER ON "THE MOODS OF INDIRECT QUOTATION"

Mr. Schlicher's suggestive paper in *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXVI, pp. 60 ff., deserves careful and detailed consideration. I shall not now raise the more obvious questions regarding the validity of his method in general, but desire briefly to call attention to two points of minor importance.

Much of the persuasive force of Mr. Schlicher's presentation arises from the circumstance that his theory so well fits the facts of German grammar that those who are imbued with the idioms of that language will be tempted to accept it. In striving for this result, however, he has exposed some vulnerable points. Obviously the theory arose from a study of the German construction. It fails when applied to the facts of Latin grammar. A moment's reflection will reveal how dissimilar are the facts of the construction in these two languages. In the German construction of indirect discourse—I speak chiefly of the older dialects—the mood, roughly speaking, answers the question: "Do I vouch for, or do I not?" In Latin it is entirely different. Here the mood determines whether the verb in question is felt to be included in the quotation or not. A theory that purports to explain the construction in both languages is inadequate if it fails to explain this vital difference. It will not be enough to answer that the difference is the result of a long specialization into diverse directions from a common source. That common source (as common it may have been) could hardly have been the simple psychological one suggested by Mr. Schlicher; for the difference here pointed out is a purely logical one.

Secondly, the examples cited from early Latin usually show a "repudiation," not of simple statements, but of commands and the like, in which one naturally expects the listener's immediate "rejection," "repudiation," or approval. *Non taces insipiens? Taceam?!* is very far from indirect discourse. Such examples can hardly be said to deal with "discourse" or matters of ordinary quotation. Though frequent in Plautus, they never once show a hint of developing a sentence similar to "*er wär' ja heimgegangen*" used with the interpretation that Mr. Schlicher gives it. As for the German examples, in his eagerness to find a basis for his complex construction in the data of parataxis, is he not relying upon "simple" sentences that are of a secondary origin, sentences that possess a certain pseudo-simplicity, but derive to a large extent both form and connotation from the complex and more explicit constructions? Certainly the tense of the verb in the example just quoted would indicate as much.

TENNEY FRANK.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Companion to Greek Studies. Edited by LEONARD WHIBLEY.
Cambridge: University Press, 1905. Pp. xxx + 672. 18s. net.

There is some appropriateness in hailing the appearance of this work in the initial number of a journal devoted to classical philology. In these days the field has become so broad that the specialist must welcome any attempt, as well conceived and executed as this is, to sum up clearly the main results of explorations in fields to which he has devoted less attention. Chap. i treats of the geography, fauna, and flora of Greece; chap. ii presents elaborate chronological tables; chap. iii embraces literature, philosophy, and science; chap. iv, art; chap. v deals with mythology and religion; chap. vi includes, under the head of public antiquities, the topics of constitutions, law and finance, population and slaves, colonies and commerce, measures, weights, and money, war, ships, and the calendar; chap. vii, on private antiquities, is equally comprehensive; chap. viii surveys the dialects, epigraphy, palaeography, textual criticism, metre, and the history of scholarship.

It will be a satisfaction to all who have had to rely on Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* to find in English such authoritative accounts, amounting to treatises in themselves, on literature, philosophy, and law, as Jebb, Jackson, and Wyse contribute to this volume. Nevertheless, there are serious deficiencies in the book as a whole. The absence of full references to authorities, except in a few of the articles, will make the book less valuable as a basis for further research; and this lack is not made up by the bibliographies appended to each section. Good bibliographies may be found, e. g., on population (p. 416), scholarship (p. 651), dress (p. 534); but many are entirely inadequate. At the end of the sections on fauna and flora no mention is made of the work of Keller, Hehn, and Hahn. Again, Cartault, Torr, and Ridgeway are the only authorities given for the trireme, though the writer of this section shows an intimate knowledge of other discussions in a recent number of the *Classical Review*.

The Table of Contents is admirably constructed, occupying twenty pages, and the four indices are helpful (though the reader will not find "ostracism" anywhere in them), but the editor might have done much more in the way of supplying cross references. In § 92, on Alexandrian criticism, there should have been a reference to § 713, and a serious conflict of statements would thereby have been avoided. In § 92 it is said

that the origin of the division of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into twenty-four books is unknown; in § 713 the division is positively attributed to Zenodotus, no authorities being given. The former statement is the safer, since ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματικῶν τῶν περὶ Ἀρίσταρχον (Ps. Plut. *Vit. Hom.* 4) is a loose expression for "grammarians," and Eustathius (*Il.*, p. 5) says that Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ μετ' ἐκείνου(!) Ζηνόδορος made the division, which leaves us still in doubt. In § 580 we read the incorrect statement that wives were present at their husbands' meals and thus might meet his friends. The facts are correctly given in § 610 by another contributor. The editor should have corrected another slip in § 580, where we read that the story of Panthea is told in the *Anabasis*; read *Cyropaedeia*.

It is hardly fair, perhaps, to carp at inconsistencies in spelling, since we have no standard in English. When, however, the editor tells us in the preface that Greek words like Nike and Pentekostys are usually transliterated, we wonder why he himself, in his excellent chapter on constitutions, should write (p. 372) the forms *Babyca* and *Cnaceion*.

It is obviously impossible to discuss at length all of the matters which a careful reading of this book suggests, but one may praise the illustrations, and wish for more; the different styles of temples, for example, should have been shown in diagrams. The type is clear, the paper is good, and the misprints, with the exception of wrongly placed acute accents, are happily infrequent.

CHARLES BURTON GULICK.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

*Kaiser Hadrian und der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom:
Eine quellenkritische Vorarbeit.* Von E. KORNEMANN,
Leipzig: Dieterich, 1905. Pp. 136. M. 4.20.

Kornemann's article was called forth by a work by Otto Schulz, entitled *Leben des Kaisers Hadrian* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1904). He presupposes knowledge of Schulz's book on the part of the reader. Both works deal with the sources and reliability of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, particularly of the life of Hadrian, but cover in a more or less cursory manner all the lives down to and including Alexander Severus.

In 1889 H. Dessau (*Hermes* XXIV [1879], pp. 337 ff.) had awakened new interest in the study of the *S. H. A.* by an investigation in which he aimed to prove that all these biographies were the work of a forger of the time of the emperor Theodosius. Mommsen (*Hermes* XXV [1880], pp. 228 ff.) so far modified this view as to retain belief in the six authors, of the time of Diocletian-Constantine, named in the manuscript, while admitting that these biographies, united in a corpus about 330 A. D., suffered from the hand of a reviser of the time of Theodosius. This theory held its ground till 1901, when, with the works of F. Leo on Greek and

Roman biography, and especially of J. M. Heer, "Der historische Wert der Vita Commodi" (*Philologus* Suppl. IX, pp. 1-208), another advance was made. It now appeared that both the compiler and the Theodosian reviser introduced changes and falsifications into the lives, which originated out of a combination of historical and biographical parts; the former valuable, the latter generally worthless.

Schulz, in his Leipzig dissertation of 1903 and in the work above cited, extended these investigations to cover all the *Lives*, from Hadrian to Caracalla. Portions of the same valuable, chronologically arranged, historical work are found in all the *Lives*, but they are mutilated and enlarged by biographical insertions and additions. Marius Maximus was author of neither the chronological nor the biographical portion, but the citations from his work were introduced either by the compiler or, as Schulz believes, by the later reviser. Kornemann strengthens and builds further on this foundation, while condemning the more general work of Lécrivain (*Études sur l'histoire Auguste*, Paris, 1904).

After this introduction we come to the main portion of Kornemann's investigations. Hadrian's birthplace is discussed on pp. 7-11. The statement of the *Vita Hadr.* 1. 3 that he was born at Rome is shown to be inconsistent with immediately succeeding statements of the same *Life*. A correction of *Romae* to *Italicae in Hispania* would not only make the entire *Life* consistent on that point, but would bring it into accord with the remaining historical evidence. Kornemann seems justified in considering the word *Romae* a change due to a later reviser.

On pp. 11-21 the question whether Hadrian was adopted by Trajan is handled. This involves an analysis of the sources of chaps. 2-4. 7 of the *Life*. Kornemann first shows that the original chronological source has suffered much more from contamination and addition than Schulz had admitted. Omitting these additions, the remainder is then divided into two portions. One, showing the gradual growth of Trajan's favor for Hadrian until the adoption, is rightly traced through the chronological source back to the *Autobiography* of Hadrian. The other, ascribing Hadrian's accession to the favor of the empress Plotina, is consequently identified with the biographical source. So far we may follow Kornemann with a fair degree of certainty, but his final decision to follow the biographical source and deny the adoption by Trajan is not so well established. The decision between varying reports of seemingly equal authority is seldom certain.

In the third section, on Hadrian's first years of rule, Kornemann follows Schulz more closely, yet here also he is inclined to reject more as later forgery or interpolation. The fourth section deals with the travels of Hadrian. These chapters, 10-14. 8, belong to the chronological portion, as Schulz had noted, but Kornemann adds that the indebtedness is of very unequal extent. While defending against Schulz the authenticity

of a few sections, he finds on the whole the story of the travels a much thinned and interpolated extract from the *Autobiography*. His position here seems secure. The fifth section takes up the second half of Hadrian's life. Kornemann follows Schulz in ascribing most of this portion to the biographical source, only relatively unimportant changes being made.

On p. 70 we come to the constructive portion of the author's work—the determination of the character, extent, and author of the anonymous historical source of the *S. H. A.* He collects from the earlier *Lives* many passages which show accurate historical information, carefulness of titular and technical references, but a marked poverty of expression, while other passages show just as decidedly the lack of these qualities. The first set must come from the anonymous historian, the second from a biographer. A comparison of similar statements in the different *Lives* still further determines the character of the anonymous history and shows that the extracts from it, made by the *S. H. A.* and especially by Spartianus, are accurate and even literal, though much abridged.

The extent and date of this history are fixed by determining which is the latest *Life* to show its influence. In opposition to the original view that it belonged to the time of Septimius Severus, Schulz maintained its use in the *Vita Caracallae*, and Lécrivain also in the *Vita Macrini*. Kornemann goes still further, claiming the use of this source in the lives of Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus. The fact that practically the same result has been reached by an investigation, independently made, in the *Life* of Heliogabalus, by a graduate student working with me, supports the general accuracy of this position, though the use of the Anonymous in the *Life* of Alexander Severus is not very clearly defined.

The best proof that the Anonymous lived and wrote in the time of Alexander Severus is found in the party character and tendency of the work, as Kornemann has set them forth. On pp. 94–102 he has collected all the passages showing the attitude toward the senate—a stately array that must impress the reader. The tendency and spirit of a single author can be surely detected throughout. On pp. 103–12 follows an admirable portrayal of the friendliness of the Anonymous to the whole house of Severus, except to Heliogabalus, and of his freedom from hostility to all emperors except the worst.

It is particularly in the portrayal of the senate, of the affairs of the city, and of the imperial policy, that the Anonymous is strong. To the provinces he pays less attention, and his knowledge seems meager except in regard to Egypt and the western provinces of Africa. Furthermore, the Anonymous was hardly friendly to the soldiery and failed in exact description of military operations. He was certainly not a soldier. It seems more likely that he was a senator, but I question whether we are ready to accept Kornemann's identification of him with Lollius Urbicus, cited only in the *Vita Diadumeni* 9. 2, where, however, it is not part of

an original historical excerpt, but, as Kornemann has noted, stands in a passage betraying the hand of a later reviser. If this be right, the possibility of a certain identification of the Anonymous with Lollius becomes very dim, though the cleverness of Kornemann's exposition must be admitted. That Lollius Urbicus, senator, son of Hadrian's favored officer, from an African family, and already aged in the time of Alexander Severus, could have written such a history as this, is easy to believe, but that he wrote this particular one we have no satisfactory proof.

On the whole, however, Kornemann's work must be most highly praised and accepted as the foundation for future investigations in the *Lives* treated. He surpasses his predecessors in his freedom from prejudice and his readiness to admit the possibility of a combination of sources as well as later revision, even in the shorter passages, which show the characteristics of this or that source. Careful analysis on this basis will, I believe, yield still further results.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

The Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire. By J. P. MAHAFFY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905. Pp. viii+154. \$1 net.

In these six lectures, delivered in the University of Chicago, Professor Mahaffy summarizes the results of twenty years' research. It is needless to say that he moves about with perfect mastery in this most difficult and most unsatisfactory, perhaps, of all great historical periods. The constant recurrence of his old-time *bêtes noires*, his high-Toryism and Homeric frankness, are more than atoned for by his charm of style and the noble and brilliant concluding lecture.

Moreover, we fully accept his defense, set forth in 1896, of the use of modern analogy, and we may go farther and disclaim the need of any Olympic aloofness in the employment of modern parallels. But is it not just to require of the historian who trenches on *current* politics that he shall vindicate his claim to do so by showing something of the qualities of the high statesman? Professor Mahaffy is both too near and too far from his home-politics.

Some grammatical slips and an Irish bull (p. 41) require correction, and on p. 55 something—perhaps a passage—appears to have dropped out before "Still more it lay." One finds it hard to account at this date for the extraordinary remark on p. 73: "The Greeks had long since laid aside the habit of consulting the wisdom of Egypt and the East, from which their civilization had once sprung."

W. S. MILNER.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

University of California Publications, Classical Philology. Vol. I.
Berkeley: University Press, 1904.

No. 1. *Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry.* By EDWARD BULL CLAPP. Pp. 1-34. 1904. \$0.50.

This paper shows the certain though vanishing use of the digamma in melic poetry. Alcmæon uses it the most freely, while Anacreon ignores it. Digamma is widely used to prevent hiatus, rarely to make position. Final diphthongs and long vowels are, with rare exceptions, shortened in hiatus, this shortening is almost exclusively found in dactylic rhythms, and there generally in the second and third feet. Melic poetry in the use of digamma and final vowels in hiatus differs from Homeric poetry in that it uses them less freely. Professor Clapp has put in clear and compact form the results of his own and of previous investigations.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

No. 2. *Studies in Si-clauses.* I. *Concessive Si-clauses in Plautus.* II. *Subjunctive Protasis with Indicative Apodosis in Plautus.* By H. C. NUTTING. Pp. 35-94. 1905. \$0.60.

Dr. Nutting's study is a piece of descriptive syntax that should exemplify the kind of analysis to which grammatical material ought to be compelled to submit before generalizations are made. It proves the uselessness of mere numerical ratios like *si sit-sit: si sit-est: a: b*, of which there has been a sufficiency. In the first section concessive *si*-clauses are analyzed under the groups of "simple" and "intensive" clauses. In the second part the occurrences of the type *si sit-est* are separately examined and grouped under the following six heads: "Pure Conditional Sentences," "Concessive Sentences," "*Si* in Object Clauses," "The Indefinite Second Singular," "Loosely Attached Clauses," and "*Mirari* (*mirum*) in Apodosis." In the subdivisions, due stress is laid upon the nature of the verb (e. g., *posse, velle*), tense, and, what is too often neglected, the closeness of attachment of the *si*-clause. Nutting reaches the only conclusion that is logical, namely, that these sentences must be studied separately, and that no "sweeping explanation can be found which is valid for all cases." On the whole, there is a strong resemblance between his method of work and results and those of Blase, whose *Studien und Kritiken* I. Teil, 1904; II. Teil, 1905 (Mainz) appeared at about the same time.

In the third section one fails to find any mention of the fact that the imperfect subjunctive may be performing the function of a preterite-future in several expressions, like *expectabam siqui eas assereret manu*, *Poen.* 1392; the distinction is certainly an essential one. Furthermore, the summary on p. 81 of the uses of *posse, quire*, and *velle* is based upon so few occurrences as to have little general validity.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

TENNEY FRANK.

- No. 3. *The Whence and Whither of the Modern Science of Language.*
By BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER. Pp. 95-109. 1905. \$0.25.

This is the address delivered at the St. Louis Congress of Arts and Science, October, 1904, in which, with characteristic appreciation of the larger aspects of a subject and skill in their presentation, are sketched the broad lines of development in the modern science of language, the general movements and points of view, with their sources and relations.

C. D. B.

- No. 4. *On the Influence of Lucretius on Horace.* By WILLIAM A. MERRILL. Pp. 111-29. 1905. \$0.25.

This paper is a laborious study of a subject to which the diligence of earlier workers had left small room for important additions. Not only genuine, or even possible, Lucretian reminiscences in Horace are adduced, but also a vast array of wholly irrelevant examples which are mere casual coincidences in the idiom of a common language. For the most part the author distinguishes reasonably between such instances and real cases of relationship, as, for instance, when he remarks that "*dormitat Homerus—Homerus sopitu' quietest* have no connection." Very true, but the reader will not escape the feeling that his own judgment is impugned by such a juxtaposition as well as by the author's comment. There are, I think, no certain examples of Lucretian influence adduced which had escaped the vigilance of Munro, and one must conclude that the investigation was made without reference to his commentary. Its value as an independent contribution to the subject should rest therefore upon the general conclusions, which set forth: that Horace was influenced by Lucretius in early life (*Sermones*), only slightly in the *Odes* i-iii, again in *Epp.* i, and not at all in his later works. This generalization is not new—it was arrived at and formulated in essentially the same terms by Weingärtner¹ more than thirty years before—nor does it seem to me entirely sound. It aims apparently to connect the influence of Lucretius with periods of addiction to Epicurean thought in the life of Horace. But the fact that in the *Epodes* (contemporary with the *Sermones*) there is no real trace of Lucretius, would suggest that the larger influence discernible again in *Epp.* i is due to the literary form and subject-matter rather than to time of composition.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

¹"De Horatio Lucretii imitatore," *Diss. Hallenses* II, p. 46. It should be added that Weingärtner's dissertation was inaccessible to the author during the preparation of his study, but was found just before publication; no allusion, however, is made to Weingärtner's general conclusions.

Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies. Par AMÉDÉE HAUVETTE. Paris: Fontemoing, 1905. Pp. x+302. Fr. 7.50.

The history of lyric poetry in Greece begins with Archilochus, poet of the lyre and sword, the first great hater and the first unsuccessful lover of Europe, a passion-swept man whose career was embittered by the pain of outraged love and the mischances of adventure on land and sea; but who found in the ebb and flow that attend human life a cause for no undue depression. Not merely is Archilochus the first Greek poet with a clear-cut individuality—an individuality more intense than that of any of his successors in the lyric art; he is an artist of a high order, a great technical innovator who influenced later Greek literature more profoundly than any other single poet. The “inventor” of the keen iambic and of trochaic verse, possibly also of the elegiac distich, he was the first to associate verses of different lengths and of different rhythms, and thus to introduce the strophe. Of this poet, vituperative, manly, and tender, the great creator in lyric poetry, there remain all told scarcely more than 275 verses or parts of verses.

The time is opportune for a re-examination of his life and art. The papyrus of Strassburg (Reitzenstein *Sitzungsber. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin* 1899, p. 857) has recently added the fragments of two poems, one of which is the model for the tenth epode of Horace. The “Monumentum Archilochi,” composed by the Parian historian Demeas perhaps as early as the fourth century, was first made known in 1900 by Hiller von Gärtringen, and is now republished, after a second inspection of the stone, in the *Inscriptiones Cycladum praeter Tenum* (Berlin, 1903). Presenting a survey of the facts referred to in the poems of Archilochus, and by referring them to the annals of Paros, Demeas’ work is valuable not only for the interpretation of the poet and as a witness to his cult at Paros, but also because it assures us that the Alexandrian chronology of the poet may well have had a basis other than mere synchronizing with events of Lydian history.

M. Hauvette, the accomplished author of the admirable work on Herodotus, had already, prior to the publication of the present volume, written on the new fragments in the *Revue des études grecques* for 1901, and on the “Monumentum” in the *Bull. de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France* for 1901. The *Archiloque* is the most important contribution to the study of the life and works of the Parian poet that has yet appeared; and it has the great advantage over the valuable essay by Crusius in Pauly-Wissowa’s *Real-Encyclopädie* that it is able to utilize the newly discovered fragments. The text of the poems is not re-edited, but in all other respects the book takes up anew every aspect of the many questions that centre about the career and art of Archilochus. We have thus a volume of three hundred pages dealing in

detail with the chronology of the life of the poet, the transmission of his works, his dialect and vocabulary, his metres and musical accompaniment, his ideas and sentiments, the character of his satire, and quality of his composition and style. Throughout the evidence is presented by M. Hauvette without prejudice, and a full command of the writings of his predecessors has begotten no spirit of subservience.

The scholar who has to deal with lyric fragments builds his theories oftenest on sand, and especially when he attempts to reconstruct a life so rich in vicissitude as that of Archilochus. Jurenka finds the ultimate source of Archilochus' disaffection with men and things in his political reverses. So unsubstantial is this that M. Hauvette, with equal uncertainty, attributes it to the slavish origin of his mother, Enipo, a name which he holds is not derived from the satirical character of the poet's verse (*ἐνίπτω*).

The limits set to this notice render impossible any adequate discussion of controverted points. We may merely call attention to some few matters of special interest. Thus, with regard to the eclipse of frag. 74, which has been regarded as affording the one sure chronological fact in the history of the poet, M. Hauvette argues with some plausibility that Aristotle's statement shows that there is nothing to prove that the poet actually witnessed the eclipse; it may not have been that of April 6, 648, visible at Thasos, but that of April 15, 657, a total eclipse for countries east of Rhodes. Of the dates to which the ἀκμή of the poet is referred, 688 is that of the beginning of his adventures at Thasos, 665 that of his sojourn at Paros after his return. This at least allows a reasonable time for the troubles at home which must have occurred after the Thasian episode and which bulk largest in the extant fragments. Rohde, on the other hand, threw overboard all the traditional chronology of the poet as based on the mere coincidence of the accession of Gyges and the colonization of Paros. In frag. 89 ἀχνημένη σκυτάλη is not to be limited to a written message—a point of some interest in connection with the controversy over the early age of writing for literary purposes. We agree with M. Hauvette that the poems of Archilochus are essentially sympotic, that is, that they were originally sung in a company of friends. With regard to the dialect, our author holds, against most dialectologists, that Archilochus did borrow epic forms (-αιο, Ἰαος, etc.) The Alexandrian edition consisted of one book of elegies, at least three books of iambics (trimeters, tetrameters, epodes), and one book of various other pieces. In the concluding chapter M. Hauvette endeavors to show that Archilochus stands nearer to the Homeric ἀοιδοί than to the spirit of the seventh century, which witnessed the most profound transformation of the Ionic spirit: "il se rattache bien plutôt à l'ionisme de l'épopée: il écrit, à quelques nuances près, la langue d'Homère, et il a aussi, des aèdes, le don d'une vision nette de la réalité, le goût des images familières, le génie

du pittoresque simple et naturel." The splendor of Homer does indeed shed some luster over the poet of Paros, but we can not find him more akin to the ἀοιδοί than to the age in which he lived. If he seems unmoved by the newer life of Ionia, it is because the stormy events of his career filled his horizon to the exclusion alike of the vanishing heroic world and of the stirring movements of the wider Ionic life. M. Hauvette does not take account of the fact that an appreciation of Archilochus' place in literature is to be gained in part by reference to the life and art of his younger contemporary Alcman, and not exclusively by comparison with the epic or the Seven Sages and nascent philosophy.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Reden und Aufsätze von Theodor Mommsen. Mit zwei Bildnissen.

Zweiter unveränderter Abdruck. Berlin: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1905. Pp. vi + 479. M. 8.

Under date of November 1, 1904, Otto Hirschfeld issues this selection from the addresses and other writings of the master, pending the gradual publication of his complete works. The book thus occupies a middle ground between the tributes paid by all the world at the time of Mommsen's death and the biographies and collected works which will in due time appear. Two addresses delivered during his rectorate of the University of Berlin (1874-75) receive the place of honor, one of these being in commemoration of the docents and students who had fallen in the war of 1870-71. Far more space is given to sixteen addresses in the Academy, together with his words of welcome upon the reception of certain new members, notably Scherer and Harnack, thus fitly concluding the series of addresses which begins with his own *Antrittsrede* in 1858—a document for the future historian of scholarship in the nineteenth century. The other addresses were for the most part delivered upon the occasion of royal birthdays, or upon that of Leibniz, patron saint of the Academy. They range in date from 1874 to 1895. In subject they give striking evidence of the wide range of Mommsen's interests, of the historic vision to which all things were equally new and old, of the political sagacity and patriotism which were never overpowered by the weight of his learning. The Roman principate and the new German Empire, national unity, scientific studies and the state, the Academy's own undertakings, Luther and the Humboldts, Frederick the Great, Queen Louisa, William the First, old age and Jacob Grimm, Tacitus' *Germania*, the times of Apollinaris Sidonius, the national odes of Horace—such was the varied menu of the academic birthday feast. Two speeches in the Prussian diet form a transition to the lectures and

miscellanies which fill the second half of the volume, the subject of these speeches being the Royal Library and the museums. Their historic interest is not diminished by the fact that most of the reforms advocated with such earnestness have now been realized, after thirty years. At last the cavalry have retreated, and the fiery sword of the *gardes du corps*—as Mommsen seemed to himself to see it—no longer warns the peaceful reader away from his coveted paradise Unter den Linden. The lectures selected are six in number (1863-91), and treat of coins, the Arval Brothers, the Roman catacombs, the German policy of Augustus, the exploration of the *limes*, and the *Carmen Saeculare* in the light of the celebrated inscription. Among the miscellaneous *Aufsätze* the majority deal with national or educational themes; but there are also articles on the history of the death penalty at Rome, and on Cornelius Gallus; brief tributes to the memory of Jahn, de Rossi, and Bamberger; finally two addresses of congratulation to Moltke on his ninetieth birthday. It is a rich and varied treat, for which we have to thank the promptness of Hirschfeld. No one can read even a small portion of these addresses and other papers without a deeper impression of the personality of the great historian than can be had from the larger works, written—especially in his later years—with a self-restraint and self-suppression of which few historical writers have been capable. The balance is here restored. The man rises above his books, even if the reader's memory can not conjure up from behind that massive pulpit of the Academy a slender figure reading one or another of these addresses in a voice feeble with age, but with an unabated vigor of expression, while a hushed audience hung upon each word as though it might be his last.

FRANK GARDNER MOORE.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

Index Phaedrianus. ADOLPHI CINQUINI, Ph.D. Mediolani: Ulricus Hoeplius, MCMV. Pp. 87. L. 3.50.

Good indices of the ancient writers are, as the author of this work maintains, greatly to be desired. He has followed the text of Lucian Müller, and states that he intends to follow the *Index* with a complete lexicon to Phaedrus. Such a work as this can be tested only by constant use; but, so far as can be determined from a brief examination, it is accurately and carefully done, and it is clearly and elegantly printed. On p. 38 *impudenti* should be *inpudenti*.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Handlexikon zu Cicero. Von H. MERGUET. Erstes Heft, A-D; Zweites Heft, D-M. Leipzig: Theodor Weicher (Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung), 1905. Each part pp. 200, M. 6.

This work serves as a supplement to the author's well-known lexicons to the orations and to the philosophical works of Cicero, in that it gives his complete vocabulary, hitherto available only in the *Thesaurus Ciceronianus* of Nizolius (about 1535), according to the latest texts and with the addition of some variant readings. The examples are not, however, exhaustive, as in the works referred to above, but are selected with the view of registering the various meanings of each word, and at the same time illustrating the syntax and style of Cicero. In the case of terms which give testimony as to matters of antiquities this also is taken account of in the choice of citations.

The accuracy of the work may be taken for granted in the case of a lexicographer of so great experience, and his success in choosing and arranging his examples can be tested only by continual use. The book is sure to be one of great value to scholars, and the reviewer wishes to state explicitly that such criticisms as he has ventured on are made solely with reference to conditions in America. Much information is properly omitted in a special lexicon of the ordinary type, which might perhaps be expected in a *Handlexikon zu Cicero*, which would seem to lie on the border-line between the special and the general lexicon.

The arrangement of the articles, which is in general that of the author's larger lexicons, is not always convenient for reference, and frequently obscures the semasiological development of the words. As is stated in the Preface, the work will be of great value to teachers and students of Latin writing, as well as to those who are pursuing special studies in Cicero, and to these it will mainly appeal in this country. All teachers of Latin will find it serviceable, but the ordinary student could use the book only in conjunction with a general lexicon. As a rule, only the primitive meanings of the words are given, while the derived and tropical senses must be inferred from the examples. This point, as well as the one mentioned above about the arrangement of the citations, may be illustrated by the article *aes*, where the first example contains the phrase *aes alienum*, calling for a meaning which is not given in the definitions, and one which is somewhat remote from the primitive sense of the word. In many cases, however, this must be admitted to be an improvement on the excessive division and subdivision of meanings which is rightly criticized by Elmer in the *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XXXV, p. xxxiv. Consistency in this respect is not always observed; for instance, under *aries* both "ram" and "battering-ram" are given, while under *aquila* we have only "eagle," though the examples include both the bird and the standard. The examples of *aries*, *aquila*,

and similar words, in which the reference is to the constellations of those names, are doubtless omitted because they are regarded as proper names, which are not included in the lexicon. In that case it is difficult to see why *Catamitus* (p. 100) is printed with a capital.

The omission of all etymologies, as well as of any information about forms, except so far as the latter can be drawn from the examples, is probably due to considerations of space. It is less easy to justify the omission of all marks of quantity, since to give them would have required no additional room. The list of works cited seems to be incomplete, since it does not contain H IV, a (= *Aratea*), from which an example is given under *cate*. On p. 95, l. 3, *canse* is printed for *canes*, and on p. 139 *coflictio* for *conflictio*.

The work is well and clearly printed, and it is gratifying to be informed that all the manuscript is in the printer's hands, and that the completion of this welcome addition to our list of special lexicons may be looked for within the year.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus. By H. A. J. MUNRO.

Second edition. London: Bell, 1905. Pp. xii+250. \$2.50 net.

Good wine needs no bush, and Munro's well-known book no additional commendation to that which the first edition so bountifully received. It has served for the stimulation of now a whole generation of students of Catullus, in spite of the fact that few of Munro's emendations of the text have been accepted by other scholars. The book has long been out of print, and will find a hearty welcome in its reissue, which was perhaps prompted by the desire to compete with a recent mechanical reproduction of the *Criticisms* along with the same author's *Aetna*.

The new edition differs from its predecessor only by including three short articles contributed by the author to the *Journal of Philology* after the publication of his book. The reader who wishes to find them, however, may feel inclined to utter a brief malediction upon the editor of the new edition, who omits to state what, or where, they are. The first, on Cat. 63. 18 (p. 143), proposes to read *hilarate procitatis* for *hilarate erocitatis* of cod. O (*erocitatis* G), citing Phil. Gloss. *procitat*, *προεκκαλείται*, and Paul. Fest. 225. 7. The emendation will hardly find acceptance. *Procitatis* is palaeographically less probable than *erocitatis* (= *erae citatis*), and *citatis* chimes in excellently with the other words expressing excited swiftness that abound in this poem.

The second note is on 64. 276 (p. 150), where Munro would read *uestis ubi* [sc. *erat*?] for *uestibuli*, criticizing Ellis' rendering of "the shelter of the royal porch" on the ground that the *uestibulum* was an unroofed fore-court. Ellis, in the second edition of his *Commentary*, did not

mention Munro's emendation, though he apparently laid the criticism to heart, changing his version to "the inclosure of the royal vestibule," and explaining *tecta* as "the buildings which made up the *vestibulum*, a spacious court from which the palace was entered." But both Munro and Ellis may perhaps be wrong in their notion of what Catullus had in mind as a *vestibulum* (Munro apparently depends on Marquardt). The poet was no archaeologist, but he doubtless knew that a Roman *vestibulum* might be, in whole or in part, a roofed portico running along the front of a house. Witness, for example, the construction of the so-called House of the Vestals in Pompeii (Strada Consolare), before its rebuilding, and the entrance portico of some of the early Roman churches. The transfer of epithet in 64. 276 is of course amply justified by such phrases as *Lydiae lacus undae* (31. 13), and *domus tecta paterna* (64. 248); and the text needs no emendation, and no such explanation as Ellis' gives. But suppose it did—could anyone but Munro believe that Catullus wrote such a banal thing as *sic tum, uestis ubi, linquentes*, etc.?

Munro's third note is on 107. 7 (p. 219), where he would read *aut magis aeuum | optandum hac uita ducere quis poterit*, a suggestion not sufficiently defended by his belief that this passage is directly imitated in *Culex* 79, nor yet by his palaeographical explanation.

But when all is said and done, Munro's book is an indispensable aid to students of Catullus, though possessors of the first edition need not feel too conscience-stricken if they do not buy the second for the sake of these three notes.

E. T. M.

Evidence in Athenian Courts. By ROBERT J. BONNER. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905. Pp. 98. \$0.75 net.

The purpose of this work, as stated by the author, is to deal with the whole subject of evidence in the courts of ancient Athens from the standpoint of English law, and most admirably has that intention been carried out. Dr. Bonner's knowledge of English legal procedure has stood him in good stead.

Only one who is both a Grecian and a lawyer could have treated the rules of evidence in Athenian courts so vividly and sympathetically, and at the same time in so thorough and scholarly a fashion.

It is true that the technical terms of the Attic law find no exact equivalent in English legal terminology, yet by the use of the latter nomenclature the subject gains, for the English reader at least, an attractiveness, a clearness, and a life which it would not otherwise possess.

For purposes of comparison and illustration this little book might well find a place in the curricula of universities and law schools in all English-speaking communities.

A. CARRUTHERS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

